OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE
ED 035 786			
CH ACC. NO. AA 000 489		Feb 70	RIEJUN70

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Robinson, Lora H.; Shoenfeld, Janet D.

TITLE
Student Participation in Academic Governance, Review 1.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
BBB01751	ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY
RMQ66000	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25;1.50		

REPORT NO.	BUREAU NO.

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
28p.

DESCRIPTORS

*Higher Education; *Student Participation; *Governance; *Administration; *Annotated Bibliography; Attitudes; Organizational Change

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT
This report deals with the growing student role in college and university administration. It contains an essay reviewing trends and findings in the literature, a lengthy annotated bibliography, and a compendium of recent institutional changes which have increased student participation in governance. The bibliography is divided into 6 sections: Surveys of Current Practices, Surveys of Attitudes, Arguments For, Against and About Student Participation, Hypothetical Models of Governance, Methods of Increasing Student Involvement, and Institutional Proposals to Increase Student Involvement or Establish New Governance Structures. The compendium covers: Addition of Students to Existing Bodies, Formation of New Committees, and New Governance Structures. Most of the items in the compendium are concerned with changes in private institutions of higher education. (JS)

AA 000 489

Review 1

Student Participation in Academic Governance

Lora H. Robinson

Janet D. Shoenfeld

ED 035 786

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HIGHER EDUCATION
The George Washington University
1 Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036

FOREWORD

Scarcely a day passes without the formation of a new college or university committee to examine the institution's mode of governance and recommend changes. In recent years, almost all committee proposals have included provisions for an expanded student role. Generally, governance committees devote their first months to a quest for information about why and how other institutions before them went about changing their governmental structure.

Frequent inquiries for such information are directed to the Clearinghouse. In order to answer these, two members of the Clearinghouse staff have written a report including a review, annotated bibliography of the literature and compendium of recent changes in college and university governance. It is our hope that administrators, faculty, students, researchers and other interested members of the higher education community–working individually as well as together–will find this report a useful tool in helping to bring about constructive change on college and university campuses.

Carl J. Lange, Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
February 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
REVIEW	1
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY	
I. Surveys of Current Practices	4
II. Surveys of Attitudes	5
III. Arguments For, Against and About Increasing Student Participation	7
IV. Hypothetical Models of Governance	10
V. Methods of Increasing Student Involvement	11
VI. Institutional Proposals To Increase Student Involvement or Establish New Governance Structures	14
COMPENDIUM OF RECENT CHANGES IN GOVERNANCE	
I. Addition of Students to Existing Bodies	20
II. Formation of New Committees	23
III. New Governance Structures	25

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, one of a network of clearinghouses established by the U.S. Office of Education, is concerned with undergraduate, graduate and professional education. A basic function of each clearinghouse is to abstract and index documents in its field. Many of the reports noted in the following bibliography are available in microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. Payment must accompany orders of less than $5.00. Abstracts of the documents appear in RESEARCH IN EDUCATION (RIE), a monthly publication of the Office of Education. RIE may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402–single copy, $1.75; annual subscription, $21.00.

The Clearinghouse operates under contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Contractors are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

REVIEW

Student demands for greater participation in academic governance have produced changes on hundreds of American campuses. The cause of "student power" unites students otherwise divided by ideological differences. Its popularity is evident in a recent Gallup Poll ("Why Students Act. . ," 1969) in which 81% of the student respondents indicated that students should have a greater say in the running of colleges. In the last two years, however, pressure to increase student involvement in policy making has come not only from the students, but also from administrators, faculty members, outside observers of the academic scene, and an increasing number of public officials.

In the literature, the proponents of student power far outnumber the opponents, and arguments based on some combination of morality and expediency are generally used to justify their position. Sharp differences arise, though, over the question of the *limits* of student influence. While many academicians are willing to agree to some redistribution of authority, most are certainly not ready to embrace the concept of the university as a democracy. Nevertheless, student pressures toward this end are likely to continue. According to Edward Schwartz (1969), former president of the US National Student Association:

> The question is no longer whether, but how; no longer how far, but how fast; and these depend, essentially, upon the ability of an old order to move, to change, and to grow.

It is the purpose of this paper to review and present an annotated bibliography documenting the nature and extent of both existing and contemplated levels of student participation in college and university governance. The bibliography is divided into six categories which correspond to broad subject areas within the general topic. Most of the items in the bibliography have appeared within the last two years.

Following the bibliography is a compendium of recent institutional changes which have increased student involvement in campus decision making across the country. Because of the comprehensiveness of a recent survey *(Constructive Changes,* 1970) of governance changes in its member institutions by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), this compendium is primarily concerned with examples of increased student involvement in the governance of *private* colleges and universities. However, some examples of growing student power at public institutions are included.

I. Surveys of Current Practices

Research surveys on student participation in academic governance have usually tried to determine what current practices and policies are, or have assessed a particular group's attitudes toward the decision-making role of students. Some studies attempt to link the two ("Governing a College," 1969) or relate current levels of student involvement to the nature of the institution (Hodgkinson, 1970).

Generally, the surveys indicate that student membership on academic committees or other governing bodies is a recent but widespread phenomenon (*Constructive Changes*; Davis, 1969). The kinds of changes that are increasing student control over university policy are almost as numerous as the institutions reporting them and few regional differences can be found (Muston, 1969). It is clear, however, that student influence is largely confined to nonacademic matters in which students have traditionally had some voice. Researchers agree that students still have little decision-making responsibility in such areas as curriculum planning, faculty selection, admissions, college fiscal policies, or general institutional planning.

II. Surveys of Attitudes

Samples of all factions–trustees, administrators, faculty, and students–have been asked for their opinions on an expanded student role in governance. They have usually also been asked to indicate in which areas, if any, they would condone or favor greater student involvement.

Of all groups, trustees express the greatest resistance to change in the governance process. Asked whether they, administrators, faculty, or students should be responsible for deciding policy in 16 areas of governance (Hartnett, 1969), trustees indicated a definite preference for a "top-down" form of government. Even in deciding such an issue as the choice of a speaker for commencement–a student-centered event–only 20% would give a major role to students.

The faculty emerges as the next most conservative faction, especially when it comes to extending student authority into areas they have traditionally controlled. The attitudes of faculty members basically determine the effectiveness of student participation in academic policy making (Aceto, 1967; Boren, 1966) for most of the changes sought by students must be approved and accommodated by the faculty. Researchers agree (Milton 1968; Wilson and Gaff, 1969) that whereas most faculty members believe that students should formulate social regulations and make their ideas heard in other areas, they would give students little or no formal control over the curriculum, degree requirements and faculty evaluation. Because faculty members are in daily contact with students and are empowered to regulate their academic progress through grades, faculty opposition to an expanded student role often represents a major obstacle. Footlick (1967; see Category III) predicts that confrontations in governance will be between students and faculty in the future.

Administrators appear to be sympathetic toward student demands. A survey of 212 deans ("Governing a College") revealed that the respondents thought administrators were not only receptive to student demands for a broader role but they actively instigated wider student involvement in governance. Sixty-five percent indicated that students should participate in administrative and academic affairs as voting members while 28% favored an advisory role. These affirmative opinions are echoed in Milton's and Orcutt's (1969) studies.

Few surveys have attempted to define the areas or means of increased student participation that would broadly be acceptable to students, faculty *and* administrators. Although some sampling has been done at individual institutions in the process of changing their governance structure, it is rarely reported formally. One study that compares responses of students, faculty and administrators on the desired extent of student involvement in various aspects of policy formation was conducted by Hekhuis (1967) who surveyed representatives of six groups at Michigan State University. He found that "participation" meant different things to different groups. Students tended to regard partici-

pation as the sharing of authority with faculty and administrators, whereas faculty members and administrators viewed student participation as advising or recommending. Again, administrators were more favorably disposed toward student involvement than were the faculty. Most administrative and faculty support for student participation (defined as advising) was in the area of student personnel administration. The faculty indicated considerable reluctance to include students in general institutional and academic administration.

III. Arguments For, Against and About Increasing Student Participation

Although all writing on the topic of student involvement in governance includes some rationale for the author's position or explanation of purpose, this category contains articles that focus on the philosophical and/or political arguments favoring or opposing an expanded student role. This approach to the subject is an extremely popular one and the advocates–at least in the literature–outnumber the opponents. Critics generally oppose significant student participation in academic policy making on the grounds that students are transients, inexperienced and incompetent. Advocates argue that colleges can benefit from the student's unique viewpoint and that participation nurtures the student's personal and intellectual growth. Although most writers urge universities to give more responsibility to students, they would generally confine the scope of their responsibility to nonacademic matters.

IV. Hypothetical Models of Governance

These articles contain suggestions for new structures incorporating student membership. Models proposed for specific institutions are included in Category VI. Most of the proposals reject the practice of electing a few students who supposedly serve as representatives for the entire student body, and instead recommend the establishment of institution-wide systems that would encourage widespread student and faculty participation. Alexander (1969), for example, suggests the creation of a student parliament made up of one representative for each 20 student petitioners and directly responsble to the university president. Hodgkinson (1968) calls for an "electronic town meeting" at which campus decisions are made on an *ad hoc* basis by all those concerned with a particular issue. Shoben (1969) proposes a bicameral system of faculty and students. Representatives would be selected from districts within the college community on the basis of common interests. He argues that this form of governance would be more organically related to the community as a whole. Hallberg (1969) also favors an all-college government. All of these proposals entail the development of broad governmental structures that foster a sense of community.

V. Methods of Increasing Student Involvement

Much of the literature deals with the practical aspects of the topic. Here, guidelines and specific examples are offered for institutions and students interested in an expanded student role in governance. They range from prescriptions by university presidents (Heffner, 1968; *Who's in Charge,* 1969) for the correct administrative stance to hard-hitting papers by students (Powell, 1970; Schwartz, 1969; Werdell, 1969) that come to terms with the levels of participation and the areas in which students have been, can be, or should be involved.

Generally, it is in these papers that the rationale for involving students in governance is carefully developed. But the authors go beyond rhetoric to describe either how institutions have responded to student demands or outline ways they could if they chose to do so. The implication throughout is that universities no longer have the choice of rejecting student participation. They must make their systems of governance more democratic or risk mounting disruption. "At the heart of student militancy, then, is the question of the proper decision-making role of the student within our institutions of higher education" (Johnstone, 1969).

VI. Institutional Proposals To Increase Student Involvement or Establish New Governance Structures

All of the speeches, case studies, committee and task force reports, constitutions and bylaws in this category are concerned with proposed or recently implemented changes in governance at specific institutions. The 35 colleges and universities include large, prestigious, small, unknown, public and private institutions in every section of the country. In order to formalize student participation at all levels, most of them have completely restructured their systems of governance and many have rewritten their constitutions.

A major impetus for reorganizing governmental structures has been the realization that the informality of old patterns of decision making has contributed to undemocratic and inefficient government. The growth experienced at many small colleges in recent years has especially strained traditional "family affair" methods of governance. By clearly defining the authority of various groups or positions, planners hope to identify the avenues for participation in campus decisions and bring about more responsive systems.

The four major recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of Students in the Government of the University of Wisconsin are representative of the kinds of changes being considered and undertaken on many campuses. The Committee advocates: (1) practically complete withdrawal by the University from its *in loco parentis* activities; (2) broader student participation of various forms in practically all areas of University government; (3) greater student self-governing authority, reduced areas and forms of direct faculty and administration supervision, and simpler means of liaison between students and faculty; and (4) restructured, limited, and clarified University disciplinary procedures.

Some of the reports describe the processes of governmental reorganization (Jenks, 1969a; Smith, 1969); others deal with the societal as well as internal pressures for specific reforms. President Homer D. Babbidge (1969) of the University of Connecticut suggests that the people of Connecticut join with all constituents of the University community in designing a charter or constitution for the University. Usually, it is evident that colleges have made some effort to evaluate the policies of other institutions before revising their own. Cleveland State University (Benovich, 1969), for example, surveyed 66 other schools in order to find out what their policies on student participation were. Another approach is that of President Harris Wofford (1969) who reflects on a year of "full partnership" with students at SUNY, Old Westbury.

Without knowing the specific character of each institution–particularly, where the power lies–it is difficult to estimate the significance of each of these administrative or legislative reforms. On some campuses, the inclusion of a few students in the academic senate has been accomplished only after months of work and turmoil, representing a substantial victory for the students and their backers. On others, the announced assignment of students to disciplinary committees may only formalize a longstanding practice. Nevertheless, the number and variety of reported changes in governance procedures, the range of institutions at which they are occurring, and the ingenuity of many of the proposals certainly indicate that efforts to share authority with students are under way and growing.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SURVEYS OF CURRENT PRACTICES

Bencovich, Joseph B. and Others. (See Category VI)

Carr, Alden J. *Student Participation in College Policy Determination and Administration.* Washington, D.C.: AACTE Study Series No. 4, 1959.

This study reports the findings obtained from a questionnaire returned by 109 institutions belonging to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The areas in which students participate in determining general policy and the channels through which this participation takes place were ascertained. Respondents indicated the extent and value of present and probable future levels of student participation. Generally, it was felt that participation should be increased, but that it should be accompanied by adequate evaluation. A short historical section and recommendations are also included. Although this study is dated, it is worth mentioning because of its systematic approach.

Constructive Changes To Ease Campus Tensions. Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1968. HE 001 349 (RIE May 70) MF - $0.50, HC - $3.10.

This useful compilation documents steps taken by approximately 90% of the state universities and land-grant colleges to involve students in governance, and to develop policies and procedures aimed at handling disruption. Part I, dealing with student participation in university policy making, is subdivided into: participation in governance, membership on committees, participation on search and screening committees, self-studies and evaluations, communication and consultation with students, involvement with boards of trustees, ombudsmen, and adoption of student suggestions. Part II contains policies on obstruction and disruption, student codes, preparedness for disruption, policies and practices regarding police, and policies on firearms. The survey strongly indicates that universities have "been making diligent efforts to deal with legitimate concerns."

Davis, Jr., John B. "A Survey of Practices Related to Student Membership on Academic Committees," Greenville, N.C.: A Report for the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees, East Carolina University, 1969, HE 001 153 (RIE Feb 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $1.30.

This study was conducted to identify current practices of institutions concerning student membership in academic committees and in certain other university governing bodies. A questionnaire was sent to 85 schools and 49 were returned. Major conclusions were: (1) more than three-fourths of the schools had a policy that provided for student membership on some academic committee; (2) such membership was a recent development, usually initiated by the administration; (3) qualifications for student membership varied but it was generally required that the student be an elected, full-time upperclassman; (4) contributions made by student members were considered significant by most schools; (5) student membership was more common on committees associated with activities that were primarily student-oriented than on those that were primarily faculty-oriented; (6) no regional differences were found.

This is a good current assessment of student participation in governance.

"Governing A College: How Much Should Students Have To Say?" *College Management* 4, May, 1969, pp. 53-54.

The views of 212 deans of students were obtained on several aspects of student participation in decision making. Responses to each question were tabulated for the total and by type of institution: university, four-year and two-year colleges. The results give a good picture of the amount of participation students now have and in which of eight areas: clubs, dorm rules, discipline, curriculum, faculty appointment, admissions, endowment use, and selection of a president. It was found that students have the least to say about faculty appointments, admissions, endowment use, and selection of a president. For the same eight areas, deans indicated whether the current voting power of students was "too little," "enough" or "too much." About one-half believed that current student participation was too low. Sixty five percent reported appeals for a larger role in governance at their institutions. Sixty-one percent believed that student members of governing bodies were as responsible as the regular members. The faculty was seen as most resistant to change.

This is an extremely good, current survey on the topic of student participation in governance. Although the results are based on less than one-half of the total sample, similar trends were found in later returning responses.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Student Protest - An Institutional and National Profile," to appear in *Teachers College Record,* February, 1970.

The purpose of this study was to identify the characteristics that distinguish institutions reporting increased student protest from those which do not. Among many variables examined in a sample of 1230 institutions was the effect of a strong student voice in institution-wide policy. The hypothesis that increased student control over institutional policy would result in a decrease in student protest was not supported by the data.

Lunn, Jr., Harry H. *The Student's Role in College Policy Making.* A Report Prepared for the Commission on Student Personnel. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1957.

This book is largely a descriptive report emphasizing throughout specific examples of different forms of student involvement in administration and policy formation. It is an important source in the study of this topic as a social movement.

Main, Jeremy. "The 'Square' Universities Are Rolling, Too," *Fortune* 79, January, 1969, pp. 104 ff.

This is a general article about the current expansion of student involvement into a wide range of university affairs. The author makes distinctions among the types of involve-

ment according to the levels at which participation takes place. One level is that of student affairs in which students are self-governing, e.g., in dormitories. Another is that of the joint committee (student-faculty or student-administrator) concerned with housekeeping matters such as parking. The third is that of the joint committee which deals with educational policy such as curriculum and tenure—the heart of university policy making.

Muston, Ray A. "Governance Changes Are Catching Colleges By Surprise: A National Survey Shows," *College and University Business* 47, July, 1969, pp. 29-31.

Of 1769 institutions surveyed for significant changes in governance during 1968, it is not clear how many institutions reported changes. The data were analyzed by type of control, regional accreditation, state, enrollment, level of degree programs, type of academic programs, and board size. They revealed that the most frequent means of involving both faculty and students was through increasing membership on standing and advisory committees. Other types of change are listed in order of the frequency of occurrence, but their frequency is not given. The author notes that the kinds of change reported were almost as numerous as the institutions reporting them.

II. SURVEYS OF ATTITUDES

Aceto, Thomas D. "Student Participation in Policy Making and the Use of Direct Action at the Mid-West Committee on Institutional Cooperation Universities." Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1967.

This study is based on a structured interview with six people at each of 11 universities attending a Committee on Institutional Cooperation Conference. The persons interviewed included the dean of students, chapter president of the American Association of University Professors, student government president, chapter president of Associated Women Students, the student newspaper editor and the chapter president of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). The author cites four major conclusions to his survey: (1) only a small minority of students want to take over the university; (2) extensive disagreement exists between deans of students and the SDS, especially on the use of direct action; (3) increased student participation in policy making can be effected only to the extent that it is welcomed by the faculty and administration in fact as well as theory; (4) nonobstructive direct action is acceptable, although it is not necessarily the preferred tactic used to initiate or change policy on the university campus.

This is one of the few sources on this topic which goes beyond the use of rhetoric to a more systematic approach to the subject.

Boren, James E. "Cooperative Government at the University of Minnesota," *Role and Structure of Student Government.* Edited by Mary Meehan. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, 1966.

This article contains the conclusions and recommendations of a master's thesis on student involvement in policy making at the University of Minnesota. Student representatives on faculty committees filled out questionnaires and committee chairmen were interviewed. It was found that: the attitude of the faculty chairman often determined the effectiveness of student participation; student participants believed the experience was valuable; students believed their committee service had improved university-student relationships and communication; and students and faculty became better acquainted. Most of the recommendations were directed to the specific situation at the University of Minnesota.

"Governing Boards: Trustees Strive To Close Generation Gap - But Not by Opening Board to Students," *College and University Business* 47, April, 1969, p. 24.

Trustees from ten universities comment on their relationship to the students in their institutions. The general consensus is that: times are changing; a trustee's role is changing; and students should not be represented on governing boards. There is no identification of what a "new" role or "new" demands will entail.

"Governing a College . . ." (See Category I)

Hartnett, Rodney T. *College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles and Educational Attitudes.* Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

This study investigated the trustee's background and other personal characteristics, his attitudes toward current higher education issues, and his duties and responsibilities as a trustee. Trustees were asked who should have the major responsibility for deciding 16 campus issues, such as: course or program changes, student housing, presidential appointment, tenure decisions, student cheating, admission criteria, fraternities and sororities, etc.

The author draws three major conclusions: "First, trustees generally favor a hierarchial system in which decisions are made at the top and passed down . . . Over 50 percent of the total sample of trustees believe that faculty and students should not have major authority in half of the 16 decisions listed." Second, trustees distinguish among the kinds of decisions for which they would allocate responsibility to other groups. Third, although they generally prefer an arrangement in which the faculty and students do not have major authority, they do not want to "rule" by themselves.

Hekhuis, Louis Frederick. "A Comparison of the Perceptions of Students and Faculty at Michigan State University With Respect to Student Participation in University Policy Formulation." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Representatives from six groups—student nonleaders, student leaders, faculty nonleaders, faculty leaders, academic administrators, and student personnel administrators—were asked to rate the extent to which they thought students should be involved in various aspects of university policy making. In most areas, policy formulation was not perceived as the sole prerogative of any one group. The major limitation of this study is the fact that it was conducted only at Michigan State University.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. *Student Participation in Campus Governance.* A paper presented at the AERA Conference, Los Angeles, California, 1969, HE 001 200 (RIE Apr 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $0.40.

This discussion of the student's role in governance is based on the results of a questionnaire administered to 3000 persons on 19 campuses and on more than 900 interviews. A great deal of variety in the patterns of student participation, both quantitatively and qualitatively, was found. There were three kinds of responses: (1) student participation was favored in the belief that better decisions would result; (2) students had been included in governance to "take the heat off"; (3) administrators believed that students should have no say, while the faculty sympathized with the administrators and students simultaneously.

Sometimes more responsibility was offered than students were willing to accept; other times there was a lag between the granting of more power to students and a corresponding increase in respect for their ability and responsibility. Most resistance was expressed to student participation in faculty promotion and retention and in curriculum matters.

The results seem positive on campuses which have had students participating for more than two years, although student participation has not proved a panacea for problems of campus unrest. On large campuses there is a special problem, because no one student representative can draw loyalty from the entire constituency. Hodgkinson believes that students are needed to improve the quality of campus decision making because they are more concerned about the quality of teaching than are either the faculty or administrators.

Milton, Ohmer. *Survey of Faculty Views on Student Participation in Decision Making.* Final Report Project No. 7-D-037. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, May, 1968, ED 024 332, MF - $0.25, HC - $1.85.

"The major purpose of this investigation was to explore faculty attitudes or opinions about student involvement in determining cogent campus policies...." An interview approach was utilized. The schedule was designed to provide quantitative and qualitative data. Each respondent could answer "yes," "no" or "don't know" and then qualify his remarks in any direction or manner desired. Eight areas of decision making were covered: student discipline, evaluation of teachers, academic calendar arrangements, curriculum planning, degree requirements, grading systems, faculty governing boards and legal governing boards. Three other questions were included in an effort to determine how respondents viewed students, how they perceived the teaching-learning process, and the extent to which they had thought about the latter in depth. A randomly selected sample of full-time faculty members were interviewed at six schools (mostly in Tennessee). Some administrators were also interviewed and their responses were compared with those of the faculty.

Generally administrators would allow more student participation than faculty. Faculty members (1) agreed that students should participate extensively in determining non-academic policies; (2) thought that students should participate in evaluating teachers, but that survey results should be shared only with the teacher; (3) rejected student participation in affairs of the governing board; (4) believed that student ideas should be obtained, though there was no consensus on how; (5) tended to be conventional in their thinking about teaching-learning issues in general. Faculty members neglected to consider the fact that participation might promote maturity and aid learning.

Orcutt, John. "How Deans and Students See It," *Focus on Action: A Handbook for Developing Junior Colleges.* Edited by Selden Menefee and John Orcutt, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, May, 1969.

This is a report of an opinion poll concerning the rights and responsibilities of students in junior colleges. A dean and a student responded at each of 12 colleges. One section inquired about the extent to which students should be involved in 22 areas of governance. In none was student participation ruled out entirely by a majority of respondents. The most frequently endorsed response was "some student involvement." This was true for such items as: faculty appointment, allocation of instructional funds, administrative structure of the college, curriculum, staff salaries, teaching loads, selection of the president, and provision of services to the community, in addition to areas of traditional student involvement. Although there is no indication of how students should be involved, the poll does provide one of the strongest endorsements of student involvement in governance to be found.

Student Power at the University of Massachusetts. A Case Study. Amherst: Massachusetts University, April, 1969, HE 001 238 (RIE Apr 70) MF - $0.50, HC - $3.70.

This essay, describing events surrounding a student demonstration at the University of Massachusetts, provides an understanding of the mechanics by which the confrontation came into being, and analyzes relevant opinions and attitudes of students. In 1968, the University's student majority supported radical student leaders in a tactical switch from Vietnam-related issues to others concerning student power. But when the radicals made subsequent demands for change "right now" in the entire administrative structure of the University, the student majority reacted negatively. A sample survey of the student body revealed widely held feelings of discontent with certain aspects of University life but not a desire to overthrow the University's administration. A survey conducted a year later showed that student opinion had shifted toward greater support of student power and black issues, and that there was a close connection between new left positions and black power advocacy. Student power and new left positions were related to age, sex, class, major, and membership in conventional student groups, but advocacy of black power was not. The conclusion of the study is that if there continues to be a wide gap between the radical leadership and a student-government oriented "left wing" of the student body, the prospect is for changes in University policy but little or no challenge to the University's administrative structure.

"Why Students Act That Way - A Gallup Study," *U.S. News and World Report* 66, June 2, 1969, pp.34-35.

In April and May 1969, 1030 youths in 55 colleges were interviewed about current issues by the Gallup Poll. Three

questions pertained to student involvement in decision making. It was reported that 81 percent of the total believed that students should have a greater say in running colleges; 75 percent said that students should have greater influence over the academic realm of college life; 42 percent believed the student protestors' biggest complaint was "not enough say in the running of colleges."

The poll gives an up-to-date look at the priorities of student concerns in college governance.

Wilson, Robert C. and Gaff, Jerry G. "Student Voice–Faculty Response," *The Research Reporter* 4, Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1969, pp. 1-4, HE 001 254 (RIE Apr 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $0.30.

As part of a study of faculty characteristics and their influence on students, questionnaires covering a wide variety of faculty attitudes, values and behavior were sent to over 1500 professors at six diverse colleges and universities. For this report, data were drawn from those collected on faculty attitudes toward student participation in campus governance. While the 1069 responding faculty were generally favorable toward student participation in the formulation of social rules, they were reluctant to share their academic power with the students. Ninety-five professors thought that students should have an equal vote with the faculty on academic matters (equal vote group) and 41 others felt that students should have no role in the formulation of academic policy (no vote group). The remaining faculty fell between these two extremes. Responses of the "extreme" groups were related to their educational philosophies, conceptions of and extra-curricular contact with students, fields of study, political orientation, and involvement in campus affairs. The equal vote group had a liberal view of society and life and a positive view of students; the no vote group was basically conservative and tended to believe that external control, motivation, and direction were needed in order for students to profit maximally from their education.

III. ARGUMENTS FOR, AGAINST AND ABOUT INCREASING STUDENT PARTICIPATION

Auerbach, Carl A. "Memo to the Members of the University Faculty on the Subject of the Task Force Recommendations on Student Representation in the University Senate and Campus Assemblies," Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, February 24, 1969, ED 028 729, MF - $0.25, HC - $0.75.

This memorandum sets forth reasons why the author thinks the proposed constitutional changes should not be adopted (See *Report of*, Category VI) and suggests certain alternatives. He argues that students should be heard but not represented for they have no persuasive claim to be permitted to vote on matters that will have an impact long after they graduate. He suggests a structure of university government that will afford students the opportunity to be heard on all matters, and he divides decision-making functions into three categories–those on which students vote alone, those on which students and faculty have an equal vote, and those on which faculty vote alone.

Bloustein, Edward J. "The New Student and His Role in American Colleges," *Liberal Education* 54, October, 1968, pp. 345-364.

The purpose of this paper was to inquire into the reasons for and the nature of the student assertion of a right to share in the management of the American college and university. The author describes the classical American college and contrasts it with today's institutions. He then details how the emergence of the "new student" may be traced from weaknesses in each of the characteristic elements of the classical college system - the hierarchical structure of authority, the fixed and ordered system of certain knowledge, a rigidly defined and severely limited set of educational functions, and a completely paternalistic relationship between the student and the college.

Brunson, May A. "Student Involvement in University Governance: Sense or Nonsense?" *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* 32, Summer, 1969, pp. 169-175.

The author lists several of the traditional arguments against student involvement such as immaturity, transiency, lack of legal responsibility, and apathy - and then refutes each one. She feels that a major factor affecting the type of involvement is institutional size. She advocates student participation, arguing that: the institution should be viewed as a community including the students; students have potential for making worthwhile contributions; the experience offers training for leadership and is good for student morale. She then lists some approaches to student participation which have been taken by various institutions.

Committee on the Student in Higher Education. *The Student in Higher Education.* New Haven, Connecticut: Hazen Foundation, January, 1968.

This report is basically concerned with the quality of student life in the broadest sense and an assessment of the treatment of students as governance participants. The Committee concluded that students are permitted little real involvement in planning their own education or in shaping the campus environment. Most institutions tacitly assume that students are "simple minded savages" who must be excluded from real governance because they are not mature enough to be trusted with responsibility. The Committee recommended increased student participation in educational policy making and student representation at the highest levels.

"Conversations," *Student Participation in University Decisions: Where Are We, Where Are We Going in the Student Movement?* Philadelphia: ARA-Slater School & College Services, 1969.

This report consists of a round table discussion among three students and two college administrators on the topic of student participation in university decisions. Each spoke from his experience at a particular institution and since experiences varied, few generalizations could be made. The group did seem to agree that student involvement is on the increase and that, in general, when students were involved, the experience was good. There was some discrepancy about the tactics students or administrators should use. The adminis-

trators preferred limited student participation – such as consultation only in some instances – whereas the student saw no limit to the kinds of university activities in which they could be involved.

Desmond, Richard. "Faculty and Student Frustrations Shaping the Future of the University," *AAUP Bulletin* 55, March, 1969, pp. 23-26.

The author calls for the faculty and administration to encourage meaningful student participation in academic governance. He believes that crises can be averted by sharing the decision making with students. He sees students as the only group with enough to gain to risk the dangers of making demands for change.

Footlick, Jerrold K. "A Testing by Protest," *The College Scene Now.* Silver Spring: Dow Jones & Company, Inc., 1967.

In a very journalistic style, this author presents some of the arguments for and against student involvement in governance. He comments on the current and predicts the future status of the student movement. "A correlation can be made between the amount of student influence and the quality of the institution; students have more influence, generally, at the good schools than they have at mediocre ones." He reasons that this is because the faculty and administration at better institutions realize more quickly the value of student concern. For the future, he predicts a student-faculty confrontation.

Frankel, Charles. "Student Power: The Rhetoric and The Possibilities," *Saturday Review* 51, November 2, 1968, pp. 23-25.

This article is a general essay on the topic of student involvement in governance. The author begins by discussing the ramifications of the use of slogans and phrases common to the movement. He then relates how students have influenced the evolution of educational theory and practice in the past. Now the question is not whether students have the right to say something, but whether it would be educationally desirable to create arrangements permitting a more visible and formal participation in the making of academic decisions. He feels that if people have some power over the way in which they live and work, they will have more interest in their experiences, learn more from them, and tend to become more responsible. Nevertheless, the author would limit student power, and would not approve of student involvement in faculty selection and retention.

"Governing a College: The Pros and Cons of Student Involvement," *College Management* 4, May, 1969, pp. 40-44.

Two faculty members from the University of Delaware debate the role students should play in the selection and retention of faculty, in curriculum decisions, and in choosing a president. The feelings and attitudes expressed toward student involvement are basically ambivalent.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Students and An Intellectual Community," *Educational Record* 49, Fall, 1968, pp. 398-406.

In this article the author touches on the topic of student participation in governance. He believes the view that students are well equipped in terms both of competence and longevity on campus to participate meaningfully in academic governance has more validity than customarily assumed. He supports his contention by comparing the campus adults' way of life to that of the students'. He claims the notion of "readiness" is used to hold students back, whereas there is evidence that five and six year olds are able to build their own curriculum in a disciplined way.

Kerlinger, Fred N. "Student Participation in University Educational Decision Making, *Teachers College Record* 70, October, 1968, pp. 45-51.

This author opposes giving students university or college decision-making power. He bases his stand on three criteria–legitimacy, responsibility and competence–and explains how their application would disqualify students from areas of governance. If students were allowed to vote, he says, the result would be both a weakening of the educational program and a change in the nature and purpose of the university.

Leadership and Responsibility on the Changing Campus: Who's in Charge Here? Washington, D.C.: Papers presented at the 8th Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, November, 1968.

This work contains 18 speeches covering topical concerns; several are on the subject of student involvement in governance.

Lewis F. Powell, Jr., dealing with current problems of administrators, says students should have a voice, but not to the degree students in South American universities have. He believes it would be irresponsible to allow this to happen, mainly because students are transient.

John J. Corson in "From Authority to Leadership" (ED 024 336, MF - $0.25, HC - $1.10) views the problem as political in the sense that it is a matter of redistributing authority among the faculty members, president, trustees, students, alumni, and administration. The current distribution of authority according to presumptions inherited from the liberal arts college of a century ago makes no sense for the large multi-function university of today.

D. W. Halladay, Joseph Kauffman and Richard Skutt discuss "The Role of the Student" (ED 029 605, MF - $0.25, HC - $0.70). Halladay considers students' "legitimate" demands - those concerned with the quality of the educational experience as they reasonably pertain to the stated objectives and resources of the institution. Such demands include: the faculty's disaffection from the basic function of good teaching, the teaching and counseling relationship between teacher and student, the relevance of subject matter, the conduct of registration, the rigid and limited requirements of some major courses of study, and the replacement of the professor by the graduate assistant.

Kauffman relates some of the conflicting traditions of the American university to present contradictory pressures. He believes that a developmental approach toward student participation in governance should be taken. Therefore, the first order of business is to improve human relationships within the college.

Skutt lists three ways in which the students' role in the university should develop: acquisition of self-governance, recognition by the faculty and administration of the student's right to participate in matters affecting his life, and establishment of the cooperative institution – a true community of scholars. He sees no reason why the control and regulation of student governments and student court systems cannot be entirely in the hands of students. In the realm of academics, students and faculty should work together.

Macneil, Ian. "The President's Commission on Student Involvement in Decision-Making. A Comment." Mimeographed. 1969. HE 001 253 (RIE Apr 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $1.60.

Based on the premise that intellectual liberty must permeate every aspect of university life, this comment is directed to individuals at Cornell University who do not understand the processes, restraints, and techniques required to preserve academic freedom. It focuses exclusively on relationships between student involvement in decision making and intellectual liberty; and suggests that before any significant change is allowed to take place, the impact of such change on academic freedom should be considered. Increased student involvement is discussed in the context of nonacademic matters, teaching, scholarship and research.

Marchese, Theodore J. "Student Participation in Plans Is No Longer a Question of Whether, But How? *College and University Business* 47, August, 1969, pp. 37-38.

This article makes a strong plea for genuinely involving students in governance. The author lists two main reasons for his stance. It would be a means of improving the range and quality of advice while enlarging and enriching the input into the planning process. The experience would also provide maximum opportunity for student growth and fulfillment. He points out practices in the past which have belied the significance of involvement. Involvement implies more than having two students attend a monthly planning meeting: "the planner-educator needs to sense that student participation has to be practically on student terms."

Martin, Warren Bryan. "Student Participation in Academic Governance," *Current Issues in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

As a rationale for his approval of substantive student participation in academic policy formation and institutional governance, Martin lists and then refutes the arguments usually given by the opposition. (1) Students are immature and lack the experience needed for such responsibility. But, as consumers, students can contribute a unique view of the classroom and educational process. (2) Students have only a short-term affiliation with the school, thus their loyalty toward it is limited. But, the average tenure of college and university presidents is about 4 years, and the faculty value job mobility and their professional guilds above their institutions. (3) If students can do a better job than the faculty, they ought to be doing the teaching. This reaction is extreme; there is no evidence that more than a tiny minority of students want to take over the university, in the classroom or anywhere else.

Martin discusses the reasons why the prospects for significant student participation are poor and challenges colleges and universities to become organized into tripartite communities in which faculty, administrators and students all share in forming and implementing policy. He outlines the framework of a proposed university-wide council.

McDonough, John R. "The Role of Students in Governing the University," *AGB Reports* 10, April, 1968, pp. 24-31.

This author opposes extending student participation in college and university decision making, arguing that it should not be a democratic process. He draws an analogy between a hospital and the university. Patients do not manage the hospital. The student's position is that of a patron or consumer who can discontinue his patronage or go elsewhere.

The author does say students have the right to be heard. But even granting this much complicates the governance process because: students think problems are urgent; new students have to be continually filled in on the issues; and students do not have to live with the decisions which are made. He then discusses the Committee of Fifteen established at Stanford to discuss university problems and policies with the power only to make recommendations.

McGehee, Nan E. "Faculty and Students, or Faculty Versus Students." Mimeographed. 1969. HE 001 262 (RIE Apr 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $0.50.

In an attempt to discover why students are demanding participation in the decision-making processes of the university, the author examines four of the most common issues they have raised: (1) student conduct codes and disciplinary procedures. This is an area in which modern college students reject institutional authority; (2) a voice in the hiring, promotion, and dismissal of faculty, and sometimes administrators; (3) curriculum planning. A major concern is for the relevance of undergraduate education to students' needs, goals, and lives; and (4) admissions and graduation requirements, grades and other matters leading to certification. Because students and faculty are more heterogeneous than before, more aware of social issues, and less patient with the slow academic pace, institutional goals should be revised. Conflicts seem to stem, the author argues, from differing perceptions of university goals.

Morison, Robert S. (See Category VI)

Morris, Arval A. "Student Participation in University Decision Making." Mimeographed. 1969, ED 031 141, MF - $0.25, HC - $0.25.

This article generally opposes extending student participation to governance. The assumptions of those demanding a voice are considered and refuted. For example, the author states that a democracy is an inappropriate model for the university community because its members are not of equal status, and it is unclear who is a member of the community and who is not. He believes that if students are let in, others will also want a voice; and if a voice is given, then students will want votes in proportion to their numbers in the university. He argues that decisions should be made on the basis of competence, thus eliminating students from curricular decisions. The author says students should be heard in these matters and suggests holding one or two annual meetings with the entire student body. He justifies student control of nonacademic policy on the basis that such concerns are related to their private lives.

"Student Participation in University Government." A Study Paper prepared for the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario by its Subcommittee on Research and Planning. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

This report presents the rationale for student involvement in governance in terms of the university's nature and goals.

The advantages and disadvantages of student membership on supreme governing bodies are outlined.

Vaccaro, Louis C. and Covert, James T., eds. *Student Freedom.* New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1969.

This collection of essays provides background information which helps explain the demands of student activists for "on the one hand, increased influence in areas of policy formation hitherto controlled by faculty or administration; on the other hand . . . a lessening of the bonds of authority that have traditionally governed their personal lives." Although all of the articles, in their consideration of the negative and positive implications of growing student freedom, are generally concerned with participation in governance, only one is specifically directed toward the topic. Theodore N. Farris, in his article, "Social Role Limitations of the Student as an Apprentice," develops the analogy of the student as an apprentice and the teacher as a master. While he urges faculty members and administrators to heed and assist "responsible student opinion," he warns against granting "the more radical demands of the students for university control."

Wilson, Logan. "Protest Politics and Campus Reform" *Administrative Law Review* 21, November, 1968, pp. 45-64, ED 028 696, MF - $0.25, HC - $1.15.

The author believes it has been increasingly evident that significant numbers of students are profoundly dissatisfied with the status quo, on as well as off the campus, and many of them are ready to use force and violence to change it. In some instances student activists want more participation in decision making, and in others they seek complete control. The organized black students generally use power tactics to gain concessions for themselves rather than to effect drastic alterations in college structure and function. Despite the ends sought by some of these groups and the use of confrontation tactics, some of the protest reflects legitimate concerns. Instead of adopting an authoritarian posture, it would seem more sensible to acknowledge the presence of student activists, keep their protest within reasonable bounds, and take a hard look at what forms of "participatory democracy" are compatible with the institution's central purpose. For whatever the nature and purposes of the university may be, order on the campus is a necessity, and responsibility for maintaining it must be shared by all members of the campus community. Institutions should be prepared to make functional and structural changes, but it should be emphasized that they exist to serve the larger society rather than to further demands of the moment on their campuses. The kind and degree of participation should depend upon individual capability.

IV. HYPOTHETICAL MODELS OF GOVERNANCE

Alexander, William M. "Rethinking Student Government for Larger Universities," *Journal of Higher Education* 40, January, 1969, pp. 39-46.

The author suggests a unique form of student government and outlines some of its features. The representatives to a student parliament would be selected by petition on a ratio of one representative to 20 petitioners. A cabinet would be elected from the parliament to prepare the parliamentary agenda. The parliament would meet two hours per week and would be directly responsible to the university president.

Auerbach, Carl A. (See Category III)

Duster, Troy. "Student Interests, Student Power, and the Swedish Experience," *The American Behavioral Scientist* 11, May, 1968, pp. 21-27, HE 000 229.

This author takes a sociological approach to the topic of student participation in college and university governance. He suggests looking at the nature of rewards for the three groups - faculty, administration and students. If differences are found, there would be justification for representation of each group in a governing council. He goes on to describe the student role in governance at Swedish universities and suggests adopting the kinds of structural devices which would most suit institutional governance here.

Hallberg, Edmond C. "An Academic Congress: A Direction in University Governance," *Phi Delta Kappan* 50, May, 1969, pp. 538-540.

The author believes that students can and should participate in collge and university governance. He proposes that a governmental form grow out of the mutual needs and purposes expressed by those governed. This long proposed concept is impossible to realize under the present system of governance. The author sees three governmental alternatives for the future: (1) students will find a place as "necessary" representatives in faculty governance as it now exists; (2) each power group will retain a separate organization and vie for power; or (3) an all-college government will be formed. The author advocates and discusses the third possibility.

Henderson, Algo D. "The Administrator/Student Conflict," *Administrative Law Review* 21, November, 1968, pp. 65-77, ED 028 696, MF - $0.25, HC - $1.15.

The author discusses various changes in higher education in terms of organizational theory. One such current change concerns the growing inclusion of students in governance. "The authoritarian and bureaucratic modes of administration that prevail among universities are not appropriate for an academic setting. The modern concept of group participation should be adopted. Administrators generally are ignorant of organizational theory and take for granted the existing structures and practices." Although faculty and administrators are resisting the movement toward participation of all members of the campus community, he thinks that students have a significant contribution to make. And since they intend to be heard, involvement should be provided to prevent recurring crises. Students are right in calling student governments "Mickey Mouse" since their sphere of responsibility is nonacademic and their authority is usually limited. Modern organizational theory using the group participative model conceives of decision making as a process that involves those affected by the decisions in relation to the degree of their interest.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. (See Category V)

Martin, Warren Bryan. (See Category III)

Shoben, Jr., Edward Joseph. "Student and University Governance: A Preliminary Sketch." Mimeographed. 1969. ED 031 138, MF - $0.25, HC - $0.50.

New governance structures must allow for personalized forms of representation if we assume that: (1) extensive participation by students in governance is a modern necessity and likely to be a permanent feature; (2) participation legitimately represents student concerns and provides a channel through which student contributions can be realized; and (3) construction of suitable machinery for greater participation is the only process by which students can become fully committed members of the academic community. This means the political process must be associated with individuals who have distinctive names and distinctive faces. Present day institutions have lost their "rootedness" in the community in which they operate, resulting in the restlessness of today.

The author goes on to describe a form of governance having several unique features designed to make the process of academic government more organically related to the community. It is a bicameral system of faculty and students, with the student assembly the lower house. The two houses would be connected by familiar machinery such as joint commissions, and the houses would have the power to initiate all bills pertaining to certain areas. Academic credit, and possibly stipends, would be given to student assemblymen. Representatives would be sent from districts defined on the basis of common interests. The author says that implementation of this system would mean a very different university, but a better one.

V. METHODS OF INCREASING STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

Benovich, Joseph B. and Others. (See Category VI)

Bowles, W. Donald. "Student Participation in Academic Governance," *Educational Record* 49, Summer, 1968, pp. 257-262.

This author discusses the power structure of higher education institutions and suggests how students who wish to achieve real influence should approach the task. Basically, his prescription is to keep in mind how academic governance actually does take place, not how it should take place. This necessitates identifying the mainsprings of power in a given institution in order to determine where to begin. The department is named as a likely target. The author suggests ways students might make themselves more acceptable to the powers that be.

Although it is not uncommon to find sympathizers for the student power movement among administrators, it is rare to find one who describes methods for obtaining influence.

Frick, Ivan E. "Reflections on Participatory Democracy," *Liberal Education* 60, May, 1969, pp. 262-271.

Although this article focuses primarily on faculty participation in college affairs, students are mentioned. Based on both his own experience and an institutional self-study at Findlay College (Ohio), the author lists six principles for aiding participants in governance: (1) grasp the nature of the college as a community; (2) create, understand and accept both general goals and specific objectives; (3) become more knowledgeable about the sociology of higher education; (4) understand that hostility and conflict are generated within the college community; (5) understand that each member of the total community has his own role; and (6) understand that participation takes time.

Heffner, Ray L. "The Student Voice in Institutional Policy," *AGB Reports* 10, February, 1968, pp. 3-10.

Speaking from his experience as president of Brown University (Rhode Island), the author discusses the role of the president in current times. He gives some of the history of Brown and relates it to current concerns. He also relates how Brown's regulations on student conduct were modified. His three prescriptions for institutional progress are: (1) enunciate institutional goals and seek understanding and acceptance by all elements of the academic community; (2) accept students as junior partners in the enterprise; (3) provide alternatives in which experimental approaches can develop so that components of the community, such as the students, are not faced with the choice of either accepting or rejecting the "system."

Hodgkinson, Harold L. *Governance and Factions–Who Decides Who Decides?* Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, July, 1968, ED 025 208, MF - $0.25, HC - $0.30.

Hodgkinson argues that student government presidents are criticized by students for being pawns of the administration and playing "sandbox government." In fact, almost all factions involved in campus governance seem to feel caught in the middle, unable to act freely, hemmed in by others, by outworn procedures and "arrangements of convenience." But, although most people appear to dislike governance, they seem to feel that they are the only people qualified to undertake it.

Hodgkinson suggests three ways to improve campus governance, but notes their potential drawbacks: (1) Set up a campus-wide governing body composed of representatives of all factions, although there is a decline in belief in the idea of representative government. (2) Give campus administrators more power than they now possess although many think they are already too powerful. (3) Make decisions on a nonrepresentative, *ad hoc* basis, by all of those concerned about any particular issue, although our institutions may be far too large to allow such a system to work.

"Issues in University Governance," A Report to the Ford Foundation on the Summer Colloquium on University Governance. New York: Institute of Higher Education, Department of Higher and Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, September, 1968, ED 028 700, MF - $0.25, HC - $2.85.

This publication contains summaries of the speeches made during a five-week colloquium. "The purpose of the colloquium was to identify more specifically the governmental issues that universities in the U.S. now face and to bring to bear on these issues scholarship from relevant fields and the views of both specialists and students . . . to derive a better understanding of the forces presently at work in institutions of higher education, to accurately identify and define critical issues, and when feasible, to propose solutions or to determine next steps to be taken in seeking solutions if further evidence is required."

In "Students' Stake in Academic Governance," Franklin Littell gives reasons why students' frustration and protests are rising and calls for changes in university governance toward a more democratic model incorporating a system of checks and balances.

In "Changing Concepts of Student Citizenship in the Contemporary University," Alan Westin argues that student citizenship now implies participation and due process. Participation is defined as "a process of sharing information, providing structures for debate and discussion, and relying on various modes or procedures for securing its assets from those persons who are part of an institution and whose rights and interests will be affected by decisions which that institution makes." He calls for participation of students in the entire range of university planning, including: the nature of university expansion, choice of fund-raising philosophy, structure and process of education, and the role of the university in the larger community. Westin says that an institution needs to provide: (1) certain basic experiences and knowledge for its members so that their decisions can be informed and meaningful and (2) alternate structures and processes since all its members are not alike.

In "Academic Government: Participants and Structures," W. H. Crowley argues that all nine interest groups having influence on institutions of higher learning have a basic right to participate in the governance of the university. Regarding student participation, he suggests adopting the Scottish pattern in which students elect an adult representative to the governing board. He also feels that students should serve on various institutional committees and make recommendations about the institution.

Carl Davidson, in "The Student and The University," is against the notion of students co-managing the affairs of the university because students then manage an oppressive system with the oppressors.

Johnstone, Bruce D. "The Student and His Power," *Journal of Higher Education* 40, March, 1969, pp. 205-218.

The author discusses six methods of exercising informal, indirect or lower level student power which would bring the total student body into an effective decision-making role. He feels that such mechanisms "constitute a far more fruitful approach to the entire set of issues concerning student power than do the traditional models of formal student government and joint governing committees." Students can attain power through: (1) lower level planning, such as the joint planning of individual courses. (This would involve students in departmental and divisional policy making.) (2) individual programs, such as credit by examination, independent study and individualized programming. (This would transfer power from faculty to students.) (3) indications of consumer preference. (4) involvement in the faculty reward system, such as publishing, course and teacher evaluations, and compelling faculty to prepare students for externally administered examinations. (5) the exposure of alternatives in experimental colleges. (6) the expression of dissent, such as lobbying, *ad hoc* committees and underground publications.

Since the "disenchanted" perceive themselves as unable to influence events and unable to gain respectful recognition, the heart of student discontent is the proper decision-making role of college students. The author discusses the limitations of various traditional mechanisms of participation, such as communications channels, student councils, and joint committees.

Joughin, Louis. "The Role of the Student in College and University Government," *Symposium on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.* Los Angeles: California Sta[illegible] College, May 22, 1968, HE 001 201 (RIE Apr 70) MI - $0.25, HC - $0.50.

The author believes that if an institution of higher education is to function, it is necessary that all components -- trustees, administration, faculty, and students -- fulfill their responsibilities. Students have a responsibility for self-development which they cannot fulfill unless they are allowed certain rights and freedoms. To facilitate their development institutions should: (1) provide for more information exchange; (2) consult with students; and (3) give students some decision-making responsibility in many areas of student life and complete responsibility for some areas of student life. As "consumers" of institutional services, students should be heard on all academic matters that concern them. The proper student role in nonacademic life is difficult to discover, but a good beginning can be made in intensive cooperative study–such as that undertaken at Brown University. A great deal of misunderstanding between students and the local community might be avoided by instituting channels of communication. Joughin says there is no group better qualified to improve the colleges and universities than the students in them.

Leadership and Responsibility on the Changing Campus:

See the note on Richard Skutt's article in Category III.

Mitau, Theodore. "Student Participation in Campus Government," St. Cloud, Minnesota: A Paper Presented at Student Convocation, St. Cloud College, February 18, 1969, ED 029 563, MF - $0.25, HC - $0.55.

The author calls for student participation in all university decisions affecting students' personal lives, their curricula, and campus environment. He feels that participatory campus democracy will have to come in order for colleges and universities to continue to be viable and dynamic. Campuses are political institutions which means there must be an accommodation of diverse viewpoints in their governance. He suggests three ways to help the governance process. Each campus should have an up-to-date table of organization indicating major decision-making agencies and their chief personnel. Every student leader should have a clear understanding of his campus organization so he can explain to fellow students how problems are processed through various administrative agencies. Students should be informed continually and respectfully on the progress of their suggestions, requests and petitions through the decision-making machinery.

Otter, Allan [illegible] Otten, Jane. "Fresh Developments st State [illegible]her Ed[illegible]n Institutions," *School and Society* 96, January 20, 1[illegible]. 48-50.

This [illegible] gives specific examples of steps taken to deal with stud[illegible]omplaints concerning lack of communication with th[illegible]lty and administration and insufficient participation [illegible] establishing school policy. Cases are cited of student rep[illegible]sentation on key faculty and administrative committees.

Powell, Jr., Robert S. "Participation is Learning," *Saturday Review* 53, January 10, 1970, p. 56ff.

The subject of the 12th annual symposium cosponsored by the *Saturday Review* and the Committee for Economic Development was "Who Runs the University?" Most of the material presented at the meeting is included in this issue. The student's perspective is provided by Robert Powell, past president of the US National Student Association. He argues that student power is aimed at changing the undemocratic character of universities, and describes steps that must be taken to enable students to take responsibility for their own learning. Most important, the current grading system must be abolished and the monopoly of faculty power over key academic decisions broken. Many examples of how students can help to shape university policies are given. Some of the other papers recommend increasing student participation in governance but none of them develops the rationale for doing so as carefully as this one.

"Proposed Alterations in the Governance of the University," Stanford, California: American Association of University Professors, Stanford University Chapter, October 3, 1968, HE 001 269 (RIE May 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $1.45.

The introduction reads: "We are dissatisfied with the style or manner of administration at Stanford. Hitherto the faculty and students have had insufficient information to discuss University policies effectively. Information that has been provided has come too little and too late. Our goal is for greater participation in setting University policy and not just ratifying it. Hence numerous recommendations ask for a greater quantity of timely information relevant to major decisions and urge increased faculty and student participation in the decision-making process." The resolutions, which are accompanied by discussion and which were accepted by the Stanford chapter of the A.A.U.P., deal with: the Board of Trustees, appointment of administrative officers, discussion of University issues, faculty and student participation in decision making, the student role in governance, crisis handling, financial matters, protection of personal privacy, and the implications for the University of external social pressures. Almost all of them refer to expanded student involvement.

Proposed Codes with Commentary: Student Conduct and Discipline Proceedings in a University Setting. New York: New York University School of Law, August, 1968, HE 001 208 (RIE Mar 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $2.00.

This report grew out of a research seminar. "The purpose was to develop a basic rationale for university regulation of student conduct that would allow students as much freedom as possible in the pursuit of their educational objectives." Student participation in the decision-making process is covered under the discussion of student rights and responsibilities. The report suggests that: the role of student government be made explicit and its actions final; students be given final authority in decisions affecting their personal lives; and student advice be heard in the area of educational policy. The group also suggests that the University could increase student participation in governance by increasing the autonomy of student organizations, creating faculty-student committees to consider policies affecting student life, selecting a faculty ombudsman, and conducting a faculty evaluation survey.

Richardson, Jr., Richard C. "Recommendations on Student Rights and Freedoms: Some Procedural Considerations for the Two-Year College," *Junior College Journal* 39, February, 1969, pp. 34-44.

This author calls for a commitment by administrators to student involvement in governance to the extent that it is feasible given students' level of experience and maturity. He then identifies areas in which students should and should not be involved. He gives them a primary role only in areas of traditional student concerns.

Schwartz, Edward. *Joint Statement on the Academic Freedom of Students. A Summary and Analysis.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, 1967. HE 001 249 (RIE Apr 70) MF - $0.50, HC - $3.50.

This booklet contains the *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students* which was adopted by the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Colleges, the U.S. National Student Association, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. It recommends that students be allowed to: participate in formulating and implementing policy; express their views freely in the classroom and in student publications; and join organizations to promote their interests. The *Statement* also proposes revision of admissions policies to ensure equal access to higher education. A lengthy section deals with procedures for administering student discipline; separation of students' academic and disciplinary records is advocated. The American Council on Education's statement on the confidentiality of student records is included.

Most of the proposals, if adopted by individual institutions, would indirectly enhance the student's role in general governance.

Schwartz, Edward, ed. *Student Power. A Collection of Readings.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, January, 1969.

"This anthology has several purposes. First, it seeks to make available . . . a number of scattered essays written by students which . . . provide an extended definition of 'student power.' Second, it draws attention to some of the specific proposals recently advanced for incorporating students into the campus decision-making process. Third, it examines several campus confrontations in considerable detail in order to provide tactical perspectives on the movement and, hopefully, to distill some collective wisdom from these experiences."

Joel R. Kramer, in "What Student Power Means," presents a student's view. He states that as long as students have no legitimate democratic voice, protest will continue. He justifies making the university a democracy and says that although there is no consensus on this issue, students are willing to fight for it and, therefore, administrators must deal with the reality of the situation. The administrators' choice is to give in on matters they are unsure of or to repress disruptions in the name of law and order. He goes on to discuss the kind of university that students would design. Its governance structure would include student parti-

cipation in general university and curriculum policy making and exclusive student control of the extracurricular domain.

In "Student Power," Henry Mayer is generally against complete independence for any one segment of a campus population. He calls for a collective, open decision-making process that affords all members genuine participation. "Student power inescapably means shared power. No question of genuine significance . . . can be decided by students alone . . ." He opposes the practice of "plugging" students into the existing system instead of developing new governance structures.

Excerpts from *The Culture of the University: Governance and Education* (See Foote, Category VI) discuss increased student participation in the governance of Berkeley; and excerpts from *The Crow Report*, by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of Students in the Government of the Madison Campus, University of Wisconsin, include the Committee's recommendations and guidelines for implementation. (See Ad Hoc Committee, Category VI.)

Edward Schwartz believes the demand for student power begins only after students become dissatisfied with univeristy policy and trust has broken down. In "Student Power -- In Response to the Questions," he points out that all factions in the university argue in favor of student power. When students challenge the authority of a particular group, however, they are labeled "rash, immature, transient, inexperienced and incompetent" by that group. Schwartz discusses why students want more say about parietal rules, the curriculum, the quality of teaching, and university priorities. He views the student power movement as more concerned with the questions of "What kind of rule?" and "What are the qualities of human rule" than with "Who rules?"

Schwebel, Robert. "Wakening Our Sleepy Universities: Student involvement in Curriculum Change," *Teachers College Record* 70, October, 1968, pp. 31-43.

This article describes specific examples of student involvement in producing curriculum changes both from within and outside the governmental structure. The author notes that the most widespread form of student involvement in educational policy making has been student attendance at meetings of curriculum and academic committees.

Sparzo, Frank J. "Facing the Issues of Student Unrest," *School and Society* 96, October 26, 1968, pp. 359-361.

The author views students as the "fourth estate" because they have gained power. He believes that the issue to be resolved is not whether students should have power, but in what areas. Areas for participation should be selected according to their contribution to the students' education and personal growth. A major problem is that neither the institution nor the students really know or agree upon what areas these are.

Werdell, Philip P. "An Open Letter to Educators on Student Participation in Decision Making." Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, 1968.

This mimeographed open letter to educators links the crisis in U.S. cities (Black Power) with the crisis in the universities (Student Power). ". . . the quality of student experience in universities today will play a powerful and perhaps determining role in the quality of life in our cities for decades to come. The central issue is effective student participation in decision making in the university - in policy formation and implementation." Werdell, one of the architects of the student educational reform movement, describes the new student culture and discusses at length 12 examples of student-initiated changes in the universities: the "Joint Statement on Student Rights and Freedoms; course and teacher evaluations; student-faculty-administration retreats; free universities and student experimental colleges; learning and living residences; community governments like Antioch, Reed, Maryville, New Rochelle and Old Westbury; curricular changes motivated by black and other minority student demands; action curricula, (e.g., the accreditation of off-campus experiences); cooperative governments; the January Plan; student development programs; and alternatives to the grading system. Some unique suggestions are offered for educators interested in participating in an "experimental action curriculum" aimed at learning about the needs and talents of their students.

Who's in Charge? A Special Report. Baltimore, Maryland: Editorial Projects for Education, A Moonshooter Report, 1969, HE 001 271 (RIE May 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $0.80.

This short report outlines the roles and problems of college trustees, presidents, faculty, and students in governing their institutions. The main topic discussed is the burgeoning power of students and the differing aims of some of the major student organizations. The article emphasizes that factions must find ways to work together as a community to preserve academic freedom and avoid the total destruction of the university. The influences of the public, the alumni, and the federal government are considered. The report notes that increasing numbers of institutions have devised, or are seeking, ways to make students an intergral part of the campus decision-making process. It includes some suggestions of President Kingman Brewster (Yale University) for peaceful student involvement: (1) Free expression must be "absolutely guaranteed, no matter how critical or demonstrative it may be." (2) Students must have an opportunity to take part in "the shaping and direction of the programs, activities, and regulations which affect them." (3) Channels of communication must be kept open. "The freedom of student expression must be matched by a willingness to listen seriously." (4) The student must be treated as an individual with "considerable latitude to design his own program and way of life."

VI. INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSALS TO INCREASE STUDENT INVOLVEMENT OR ESTABLISH NEW GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of Students in the Government of the University. "Report to the University Committee." Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1968, HE 001 347 (RIE May 70) MF–$0.25. HC- $2.95.

This report (The Crow Report) examines past policies and practices regarding student participation in governing the University of Wisconsin, and recommends 17 structural and functional changes aimed at increasing student authority.

The proposals would release the University from all *in loco parentis* activities, compel all committees to review their policies on student membership, and considerably simplify disciplinary procedures.

Babbidge, Jr., Homer D. *Eighth Annual Faculty Convocation.* Storrs: University of Connecticut, November 6, 1969, HE 001 268 (RIE May 70) MF–$0.25, HC–$0.75.

In this address, the President of the University of Connecticut reviews a number of important issues on his campus. He discusses a recent "separatist" move of the Student Senate to assume control of the dormitories. "The alternative to student separation is, of course, more effective and powerful student participation in some form of community government, based on a recognition of common interests and the legitimacy of each one's interest in the affairs of all." Rejecting the notion of a separate student government, he urges adoption of a unicameral governing body and a major overhaul of the existing governmental structure to make it more responsive to members of the academic community. He argues that the people of Connecticut (because they "have paid for and own all of our academic facilities") deserve to participate in designing a charter or constitution for the University. He suggests that a constitutional convention be convened and that, later, the Board of Trustees assume the role of supreme court charged with ensuring that the actions of everyone involved in institutional legislative or executive policy are in accordance with the constitution.

Benovich, Joseph B. and Others. *Report of the President's Committee on Student Involvement in the University.* Ohio: Cleveland State University, May 16, 1969, HE 001 274 (RIE May 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $1.80.

Originally established to consider expanded faculty and student involvement in the governance of Cleveland State University (Ohio), the Committee decided to concentrate on matters of student participation. It also decided to recommend changes within the existing governmental structure rather than encourage establishment of a new structure. Background material was studied, meetings were held and two questionnaires were administered–one to deans, departmental chairmen and various other academic units at Cleveland State, and another to 66 universities asking for information on student involvement in governance at their institutions. The responses to the second questionnaire are tabulated in the report. All of the universities indicated they were "rethinking" or had recently revised their policies on student involvement in governance. Brief explanations of their reasons for doing so are offered. Recommendations of the Committee call for student membership on 17 University committees and representation at departmental meetings. Recommendations also specify: the number of students to be included on each committee, method of selection, academic qualifications necessary, and terms of appointment.

Blair, Carolyn L. *All-College Council at Maryville College.* Tennessee: Maryville College, 1969, HE 001 259 (RIE Apr 70) MF–$0.25, HC–$0.35.

In May 1968, the Special Committee on Community Life and Structure of Maryville College recommended that an All-College Council be organized. Following approval of this recommendation by the Executive Council of the Faculty, council members were chosen in a campus-wide election. The members were six students from the three upper classes; six faculty members from three groups selected on the basis of tenure; and six administrative officers, from those whose positions, in the judgment of the administrative staff, would make them most useful on the Council. The President, Academic Dean, and Secretary of the Faculty would be automatic members. In January 1969, the All-College Council was installed as the chief deliberative and legislative body for Maryville College. It is responsible for long-range planning and for directing the activities of the entire college community, under the broad purposes and policies set forth by the Board of Directors. The 3 coordinating councils that supplement the Council are responsible for activities in academic, religious, social, cultural and recreational affairs. Smaller committees within the coordinating councils direct specific programs.

Brewster, Jr., Kingman. *The Report of the President. Yale University: 1967-68.* New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University, September, 1968, HE 001 248 (RIE Apr 70) MF–$0.25, HC–$2.05.

The governance of Yale University and the relationship of this institution to urban problems in New Haven are discussed within the framework of what the distinctive nature and central mission of a university should be. The first section of the report analyzes the roles of Yale's faculty members, administrators, and students in its governmental structure. Five basic recommendations for increased participation by students and faculty as well as increased mutual respect among the three groups are presented. The second section discusses the current commitment of Yale to the solution of pressing social problems in New Haven in the areas of neighborhood development, health, social work, tutoring, legal assistance, and employment. Ways are suggested in which the University could increase its contribution to the attack on the city's social and educational problems without diverting its resources or distracting its members from their primary goals.

Caffrey, John, ed. *The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

This book covers the proceedings of the 1968 annual meeting of the American Council on Education. Many of the papers touch on or are related to the topic of student participation in governance, and several deal with it directly. C. Peter Magrath discusses confrontations over the student conduct rules and disciplinary proceedings at Brown-Pembroke University (Rhode Island) and the body created to deal with this area, the University Council on Student Affairs, in an article entitled "Student Participation: What Happens When We Try It?"

Allan P. Sindler, in "A Case Study in Student-University Relations," reports on the work of a commission at Cornell (New York) which studied "the broad area of student affairs and conduct, law enforcement on campus, the interdependence of university regulations and local, state and federal law, and university procedures in all these areas."

Robert D. Clark details the changes at San Jose State College (California) following disturbances on campus. Among the changes were some related to increasing student participation in governance. "Several committees intended to in-

crease student liaison with the faculty and administration were created; moreover, students were seated on several important faculty committees and given voting membership on the Academic Council, the college's delegate legislative body."

Other authors, Joseph Whaley, Joseph M. Hendricks and Martha Peterson, using the Magrath and Sindler reports as a springboard, comment more generally on the topic.

"Campus Government at Stanford," *Universities* 96, October 12, 1968, p. 330.

This is a report on a recommended new system for campus rule making and enforcement giving students greater responsibility in these areas at Stanford University (California). The plan came about as the result of a three-day sit-in at the Old Student Union. Basically, the plan creates an 11-man student conduct legislative council and a nine-man judicial council. The faculty would retain the majority of seats on both.

Charter and By-Laws of the Spring Hill College Senate. Mobile, Alabama: Spring Hill College, 1969, HE 001 310 (RIE May 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $0.55.

These documents outline the purposes, functions, and powers of the new Spring Hill College Senate, which is composed of 13 faculty members and four students. In a letter accompanying these papers, the College's Vice President wrote: "In general, our Senate has worked remarkably well as a unifying factor between the student body, the faculty, and the administration. The Senate has a great deal of authority over the functions of the academic and student personnel divisions of the college. It also has advisory power over other operations of the college. The fact that four students are on this body and meet regularly with it is significant in that it gives students a voice in the shaping of curricular and student personnel policies. Students have been among the most articulate members of the Senate and have exercised a wholesome and worthwhile influence upon it."

The College Senate. By-Laws. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Franklin and Marshall College, November 26, 1969, HE 001 257 (RIE Apr 70) MF–$0.25, HC–$0.30.

These By-Laws, drafted by the faculty of Franklin and Marshall College, establish a College Senate that will be responsible for "(1) the consideration and disposition of matters affecting the welfare of the College, and (2) preserving and advancing the well-being of the College as a whole." The Senate will consist of 20 members: 12 regular and three at-large faculty members who will serve three-year terms; three student representatives who will serve one-year terms; and the President and Dean of the College, who will serve as long as they hold those offices. The By-Laws present a detailed explanation of how faculty and student members will be nominated and elected. The Senate, which will be empowered to discuss, examine, and establish policies related to the academic life of the College, is granted most of the powers and prerogatives that now reside in the faculty as a whole. It would meet at least once a month with a quorum of 14 members required for the conduct of business. These meetings will be open to members of the College community, although the Senate has the power to hold closed meetings. Senate decisions are to be regularly reported in writing to the faculty and also made known to the rest of the College community. Questions, proposals, or comments concerning the general welfare of the College may also be made during meetings of the full faculty, which are to be held at least once a semester.

"Constitution of the Yeshiva College Senate." New York: Yeshiva College, 1969, HE 001 267 (RIE May 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $0.45.

According to the preamble to its new constitution, the Yeshiva College Senate will "share responsibility for the operations and improvement of the College among the groups that constitute the College." The Senate is to be composed of five administrators, eight faculty members, six students, and one non-voting alumnus. Article I details their selection, terms of office, and procedural matters. Article II delineates the Senate's scope. It is to have jurisdiction over: academic standards, admissions policy, curriculum, degree requirements, the establishment of new majors and courses, policy determination in the areas of standards of scholastic performance, student attendance, the grading system and academic honors, and disposition of all matters submitted to it by the administration, faculty and student council. In addition, the Senate will make policy recommendations on matters affecting faculty welfare including appointments, promotions, leaves of absence, honors, and remuneration. Article III outlines the appointment of two student members each to a number of committees. Article IV refers to constitutional amendments. An Appendix lists the functions of the Senate committees.

"Final Report of the Antioch College Commission on Governance." Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, June, 1968.

The report is concerned with four major topics: the formal governance structure and suggestions for its change, faculty personnel policies, the existing education program and a model for its revision. It also reviews and offers recommendations on other areas and problems, such as: the information system, community data groups (to do research on Antioch and make information available), administrative data processing, administrative officers, consultation on institutional management, curriculum, administration of elections, educational and social change, and the quality of relationships within the college community.

Foote, Caleb; Mayer, Henry and Associates. *The Culture of the University: Governance and Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

This book is the complete official report of the faculty-student Study Commission on University Governance appointed in January, 1967 by the Berkeley Academic Senate and the Senate of Associated Students. Although the book is concerned with total university governance, it is especially concerned with increasing effective student participation. Governance is discussed primarily from the standpoint of the University of California, Berkeley campus. Chapter VI deals primarily with the rationale for student participation and gives specific consideration to the areas of education policy making, conduct and welfare services. General goals rather than specific recommendations are offered.

Governance Report. New York: Queens College, City University of New York, November, 1969, HE 001 272 (RIE May 70) MF–$0.25, HC–$0.55.

This paper, attacking "fundamental and important campus issues," grew out of the work of a committee of students, faculty and administrators. It recommends creation of an Academic Senate to replace the Faculty Senate as the supreme legislative body of Queens College. The new body is to be composed of 54 tenured faculty, 18 non-tenured faculty, and 36 students, as well as several *ex officio* non-voting members. Rules governing meetings, selection of members and elections are included. The Senate is to have the power to: determine policies, standards, programs and goals of the College; safeguard academic freedom, advise and consent on the appointment of the president and all deans, recommend candidates for the presidency and deanships as vacancies occur; propose amendments and revisions to the Bylaws of the Board of Higher Education; and provide for the implementation of the foregoing powers. As of January 2, 1970, the Report had been approved by the Faculty Council and the student body and was awaiting approval by the Queens College Committee, the CUNY Committee and the CUNY Board of Higher Education.

"Governing a College: Curriculum, yes; Social life, no!" *College Management* 4, May, 1969, pp. 53-54.

This article discusses the students' participation in decision making at Guilford College (North Carolina). This is a Quaker School, and because of the religious nature of the institution, students have made fewer inroads with respect to parietals than other areas of decision making.

"Governing a College: A Unified Command," *College Management* 4, May, 1969, pp. 48-49.

This article describes a new unicameral university senate adopted by the University of New Hampshire. The senate is composed of 30 faculty members, 30 undergraduates, 12 administrators and 5 graduate students. Other features of the plan are also given.

"Governing a College: Whose Man is the Chancellor?" *College Management* 4, May, 1969, pp.56-60.

This article describes an attempt by the trustees of Syracuse University (New York) to involve students and faculty in the process of selecting a new chancellor.

Jenks, R. Stephen. *The Student Role in Faculty Selection, Evaluation and Retention.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, November 10, 1969, HE 001 226 (RIE May 70) MF - $0.25 HC - $0.45.

Arguing that it is difficult to discuss the student's role in selection, evaluation and retention outside the broader context of the student's role in decision making as set forth in the new unicameral system (see Jenks, HE 001 251), the author describes the new government at the University of New Hampshire and some of the processes the institution went through in achieving the reorganization. The Committee on Government Organization found that most institutions that had recently included students in the governance process had done so by adding students to existing decision-making bodies. It decided that merely adding students to the old University Senate "would leave an already inefficient and unwieldy body even more so" and thus a complete restructuring was necessary. Two convocations and many open meetings were held to explain the details and purposes of the proposed changes before they were approved by a referendum, the president and the Board of Trustees. The new Senate held its first meeting in June, 1969. The following report deals specifically with its structure.

Jenks, R. Stephen and Others. *Report of the Committee on Government Organization.* Durham: University of New Hampshire, March 6, 1969, HE 001 251 (RIE Apr 70) MF–$0.25, HC–$0.40.

This report presents in detail a unicameral government structure with supporting student and faculty caucuses, established at the University of New Hampshire by its Committee on Government Organization to: (1) provide maximum participation to all members of the university community on a fair and equitable basis, and (2) provide a more efficient structure than the existing one with its competing power groups. Particular attention was given to the student role. The proposed 77-member University Senate comprises 30 undergraduate students, 30 faculty members, 12 administrators and five graduate students. Its work is organized by an internal Executive Council that, among other things, serves the President of the University in an advisory capacity, prepares the agenda for Senate meetings, recommends nominations to all Senate committees, and takes actions on an interim basis between meetings and during vacation periods. The faculty and student caucuses are composed of senators representing faculty and undergraduate students respectively. Every year, each caucus selects a chairman from one of its members who serves on the Executive Council and presides at meetings of the respective caucuses. The hope is that the unicameral structure will unite the university community by bringing together and promoting trust among students, faculty members, and administrators.

Knock, Gary H. and Others. *The Report of the Commission on Student Participation in University Life.* Oxford, Ohio: Miami University, September, 1969, HE 001 250 (RIE Apr 70) MF–$0.25, HC–$1.90.

The Commission on Student Participation in University Life at Miami University carefully examined many dimensions of student life and University affairs with the objective of providing a framework within which a student may accept greater responsibility for the consequences of his behavior and for planning his own future. In this statement, the Commission presents the basis for its investigation, offers a rationale for student participation in university life, and considers how such participation may be accomplished within the structure of Miami University. The discussion is presented with the Commission's recommendations under ten major headings: university governance, academic activities, student advising, communications within the University, freshman orientation, commuting students, black students, women students, residential activities, and extra curricular activities. Emphasis is placed on student involvement in policy making. Separate recommendations and six appendices containing papers dealing with other subjects related to student participation in university life accompany the report.

Meehan, Mary, ed. *Role and Structure of Student Government.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, 1966.

The book is intended as a reference manual for students dealing with the "why" and "how" of student government. The first part consists of a series of readings on the theoreti-

cal role of student government. The second part presents a comprehensive picture of student government structures. The appendices contain sample constitutions.

"A Statement of Principles and Pragmatics," a platform presented during Spring 1965 student government elections at City College of New York, is concerned with reforms intended to increase student participation in decision making, as well as other topics.

"Student Representation in Campus Government," by Mary Meehan, examines the advantages and disadvantages of three major forms of student representation in campus government: through student government, cooperative government or extensive representation on faculty and administrative committees, and community government.

"Community Government at Reed College," by Charles Goldmark, et al, is a case study describing student involvement in a new governance structure.

James E. Boren's "Cooperative Government at the University of Minnesota" is annotated in Category II.

Morison, Robert S. *The President's Commission on Student Involvement in Decision Making. The Chairman's Report.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, June 11, 1969, HE 001 252 (RIE Apr 70) MF–$0.50, HC–$5.05.

This report is based on the premise that the principal functions of the modern university are teaching, research, and public service. The first section of the report briefly reviews these three functions and discusses: (1) the development of the relationship between the university and society, particularly as this development has occurred in the United States; (2) the complex nature of university administration; and (3) reasons underlying student discontent and how they are related to the quality of a student's life as a member of the university community, to the quality of his educational experience, and to his relationship to the university as a concerned citizen. The second section of the report recommends administrative changes that could be undertaken for the redistribution of power both within the existing framework of Cornell University and at other universities. This discussion covers Cornell's academic and educational environments as they relate to student development; the need for a new administrative device for dealing with major policy issues; and fundamental issues concerning the university's relationship to U.S. national policy. A paper submitted by Ian Macneil (see Category III) comments on the *Chairman's Report.*

A Progress Report by The Committee on University Governance. Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, May 6, 1969, HE 001 255 (RIE Apr 70) MF–$0.25, HC–$0.50.

Based on its conclusion that a unicameral senate would be both desirable and feasible, Florida Atlantic University's Committee on University Governance drafted a proposal to establish a "single university-wide Senate, which truly represents Administration, Faculty, and Students." The two parts of the proposal present (1) the composition of the Senate membership and procedures for selecting Senate members; and (2) the composition and number of Senate committees. This report discusses both parts in detail. The proposed 139-member Senate would include 70 faculty members, 48 students, and 21 administrative officers, all of whom would serve one-year terms. Fifty faculty members would be elected from each of eight colleges in the fall of each year; the three student officers and 21 student members-at-large would be elected in yearly spring elections. No election procedure would be required for the administrative officers, all of whom would be *ex officio* members. Senate committee members would serve one-year terms on 11 committees that would deal with the following matters: university budget; steering and policy; promotion, tenure and honorary degrees; academic freedom and due process; admissions and petitions; curriculum; research; library; publications; physical space; and cultural affairs and activities.

A Proposal to Establish The Council of the Princeton University Community. A Report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University. New Jersey: Princeton University, May, 1969, HE 001 226 (RIE Apr 70) MF–$0.25, HC–$1.80.

To effect a system of university governance in which a broad range of opinion may be brought to bear on policy issues and in which differences of opinion within and among groups may be heard, Princeton University's Special Committee on the Structure of the University has proposed the establishment of the Council of the Princeton University Community. The proposed Council would have the authority to "consider and investigate any question of University policy, any aspect of the governing of the University, and any general issue related to the welfare of the University." Part I presents the basic features of the Council, and states how it may be expected to operate in practice and how it would fit into Princeton's governmental structure. Part II contains the Charter of the Council, which describes the authority, membership, organization, and procedures of the proposed Council. The 57 Council members would include representatives of the faculty, administration, undergraduate and graduate students, alumni, the Staff Council, and the professional library, research, technical, and office staffs. The President of Princeton University would be the Council's presiding officer and Chairman of its 15-member Executive Committee. The Charter provides for six standing committees: one each on governance, rights and rules, priorities, relations with the local community, resources, and judicial matters.

Proposed Constitution for a University Senate of Morehead State University. Recommendations of the Special Committee on University Government. Kentucky: Morehead State University, May 20, 1969, HE 001 273 (RIE May 70) MF–$0.25, HC–0.35.

This proposed constitution for a University Senate was approved by the faculty of Morehead State University in May 1969, and by the Board of Regents in June 1969. The Senate's duties are to act: as an advisory body in developing institutional policies; as a liaison among various elements in the University and between those elements and the Board of Regents; as a deliberative body on any issue that might arise; and as a coordinator of the work of University committees. Students are voting members of the new Senate. Rules governing their election are included.

Recommendations for the Governance of Wesleyan University. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University, September, 1969, HE 001 270 (RIE May 70) MF–$0.25, HC–$1.15.

This report deals mainly with new responsibilities and procedures for Wesleyan's Board of Trustees. Two of the essential goals of the reorganization were to engage faculty and students in the decision-making processes of the Board

through voting memberships on committees, and to enable them to participate in open Board meeting discussions of recommendations they or others helped to formulate. Recommendations are offered.

Report of the University of Minnesota Task Force on Student Representation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, January 2, 1969, ED 028 707 MF–$0.25, HC–$0.85.

The Task Force on Student Representation recommends that a step be taken toward a true University Senate by incorporating students as full participants in the Senate and Assemblies as well as increasing their membership in Senate and Assembly committees. Specific recommendations are made concerning implementation. Students are specifically excluded from the University Committee on Tenure and the Senate Judicial Committee.

Revised Report of the Committee on University Governance. The Executive Committee of the Committee on University Governance. Binghampton: State University of New York, March 14, 1969, ED 028 736, MF - $0.25, HC - $1.35.

The Committee on University Governance, composed of elected undergraduates, graduate students, faculty and administrators, was established to investigate the University's system of governance and to recommend changes necessary for instituting a system of community governance. The report presents a new form of governance in which authority and responsibility in decision making are shared by students, faculty and administrators. Section I details the structure of college, graduate school, and University assemblies. Sections II to V cover educational policies, admissions, University personnel policy and procedures, and social regulations. Section VI recommends an integrated judicial system composed of four levels of boards, and specifies their areas of jurisdiction. Section VII to IX discuss the rights and obligations of faculty, students and administrators, amendment procedures for changing the overall structure of university governance, and implementation of the proposals in the report.

Schwartz, Edward, ed. *Student Power* (See Category V)

Second Interim Report to the Trustees of Columbia University. New York: Columbia University, March 17, 1969, ED 029 586, MF - $0.25, HC - $0.45.

The subject of this report is student participation in the governance of Columbia University. The Committee proposed that: a University Senate including student members be established to replace the present University Council and Advisory Committee of the Faculties to the President; the Trustees establish procedures for consultation with the Senate on certain matters such as selection of the president; and the opportunities for meaningful participation in University affairs at the school, faculty, and departmental level be fostered. (See *Third Interim Report,* Category VI.)

Senate Code. Lawrence: The University of Kansas, December 20, 1968, HE 001 258 (RIE Apr 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $0.85.

This Code outlines the structure and functions of the new University Senate which is composed of the Chancellor, Provosts and Vice Chancellor, members of the Faculty Senate, and members of the Student Senate. Students are represented on the University Council, Senate Executive Committee, faculty and student executive committees, and on the standing committees of the Senate and University Boards.

Smith, Thomas A. "The Trinity College Council. . .Experiment in Collegiality," *Trinity Alumni Magazine* 10, Summer, 1969, pp. 18-22, 47-49.

This article describes the first year of the Trinity College Council, a group of four students, four faculty members and four administrators formed to advise the president on non-academic issues of concern to the College and to make recommendations for action. It discusses the work of the Council in: establishing a College-wide set of regulatory procedures, instituting rules governing the confidentiality of records, participating in long-range institutional planning, recommending admission of students to the Board of Trustees, studying drug abuse on campus, revising parietal rules, and examining the issue of Air Force ROTC and winning renegotiation of the contract with the Air Force. Although there is room for improvement, "As an experiment in collegiality . . . (the Council) was a success."

Splete, Allen P. *An Interim Report on Student Representation in the Academic Community at Syracuse University.* New York: Syracuse University, May, 1969, HE 001 311 (RIE May 70) MF - $0.25, HC - $0.95.

This report documents and describes the substantial student representation at the all-University, college or school, and departmental levels of Syracuse University. It notes that 25 students are members of six major policy-making committees, that 17 graduate and 28 undergraduate students will become members of the University Senate in Fall 1969, and that 11 students were members of the 33-member Selection Committee for a New Chancellor. "These are major changes at Syracuse and I think we will find other schools seeking to broaden avenues of student participation in a similar manner." The Bylaws of the Senate as amended on December 17, 1969 are included. They describe the Senate's membership and the functions of its committees.

The Study of Education at Stanford. Report to the University. "Government of the University." California: Stanford University, February, 1969, HE 001 142 (RIE Feb 70) MF - $0.50, HC - $5.85.

This report is the tenth and last of a series. The series, based on the concept that education should be a continuous process of discovery throughout life, sets forth recommendations for strengthening the academic enterprise at Stanford University. In this report, the Committee on Government focuses on those aspects of governance for which specific changes might afford some promise of marked administrative improvement. Recommendations cover the responsibilities of the Board of Trustees, the roles of the president and other principal administrative officers, school and departmental administrators, university-wide faculty committees, and student participation in faculty committees.

Noting that academic power rests primarily with the faculty and that power is exercised through the work of committees, the Committee recommends student membership on faculty committees as the most effective way to secure greater student involvement in academic decision making. It also recommends student membership on committees of the Board of Trustees and nonvoting student membership in the Senate.

Third Interim Report to the Trustees of Columbia University. New York: Columbia University, May 12, 1969, ED 028 751, MF - $0.25, HC - $0.95.

The Special Committee evaluated an Executive Committee's proposal to establish a representative University Senate and recommends its adoption (See *Second Interim* Report, Category VI). This plan had earlier been approved by the vote of almost 44% of the faculty and student body. Resolutions amending the Bylaws and Statutes are included. The election, eligibility, recall and terms of office of faculty, students, administrators and other representatives, and the responsibilities and powers of the Senate are covered.

Twenty-one of the 101-member Senate would be students. The Special Committee recommended that the Deans of Columbia College and Graduate Faculties also be included in the Senate membership and clarified the role of the Trustees. The Senate would be a policy-making body which would consider all matters of University-wide concern.

Wofford, Harris. "New and Old Actors in Institutional Decision Making," *Current Campus Issues.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: University Consultants, Inc., 1969.

A very interesting and candid account of the birth and development of the State University of New York at Old Westbury is presented by its founding president Harris Wofford. Intended as an experimental institution that would admit students as "full partners" in the academic world, Old Westbury underwent a stormy but not unsuccessful first year as a result of conflicting interpretations of full partnership.

COMPENDIUM OF RECENT CHANGES IN GOVERNANCE

As the literature makes clear, there is a large body of sympathetic opinion among educators on the issue of student participation in university governance. Throughout the country, moreover, institutions are moving to translate paper proposals into reality. The recent NASULGC report (*Constructive Changes)* notes that:

> ...universities have also been making diligent efforts to deal with legitimate student concerns, and to involve students more deeply in campus governance. Although students have participated in campus decision-making at some universities for many years, in recent years this involvement has been intensified and expanded. Similarly, in recent years, an unprecedented number of specific reforms and changes have been adopted on campuses across the country in direct response to student concerns.

This compendium documents many of the changes in governance processes which have been proposed or have actually taken place in the past two years. The items were collected from newspapers (mainly the *New York Times, Washington Post,* and *Wall Street Journal*), magazines, newsletters, and press releases from national higher education associations and the colleges and universities themselves.

The items are divided into three broad groups. The first and largest deals with the addition of students to existing administrative bodies, such as university senates, faculty senates, boards of trustees, and committees.

The second group contains examples of the creation or proposed creation of new policy-making bodies on which students are represented. Some of these committees were formed to serve specific purposes, and thus are only temporary in nature. These include search committees for new presidents or deans, task forces on community relations and responsibilities, and institutional self-study commissions. Many others, however, are intended to be permanent and have been integrated with the existing governance structure.

The third group consists of examples of totally new systems of college or university government which give students a substantially greater role in decision making than they previously had. These changes include, for the most part, the formation of bicameral or unicameral governing bodies. Many of the reports describing these proposed, new, or soon to be ratified structures are annotated in Category VI of the bibliography.

I. ADDITION OF STUDENTS TO EXISTING BODIES

University of Alabama
Students will be included on standing committees of the University. Student government leaders will be consulted about new administrative appointments. The entire student body will also evaluate professors and courses for publication in the faculty-course evaluation newspaper.

American University (Wash, DC)
For the first time, 12 students have been admitted to the University Senate with full rights of participation. In addition, 3 students have become non-voting participants at Board of Trustees' meetings.

Antioch College (Ohio)
A commission on governance recommended placement of 5 faculty members and 5 students on the Board of Trustees for 3-year terms.

University of Arkansas
Students are represented on all faculty-administrative committees and on each committee of the University Senate.

State College of Arkansas
Students will serve on the College discipline committee which rules on breaches of conduct and violation of college rules.

Berea College (Ky)
The faculty voted to add students as voting members to most faculty committees. These representatives will be selected by the student government association.

Boston College (Mass)
A small number of students have been seated on the Faculty Senate.

Catholic University (Wash, DC)
During the past two years, students have been added to all major committees, except the President's Council and the chief advisory group on administrative and academic matters.

Cleveland State University (Ohio)
The self-governing powers of students have been increased in a Bill of Rights adopted by the Board of Trustees. Students became members of University committees and participants at departmental meetings (See Benovich, Category VI).

Coker College (SC)
A student and professor have become voting members of the Board of Trustees.

Colby College (Maine)
A constitutional convention composed of students, faculty, administrators, alumni, trustees and parents recommended: (1) making 2 students non-voting members of the Board of Trustees and voting members of all committees of the Board; (2) making 2 students, selected by the student government, voting members at all faculty meetings and adding students as voting members of college committees; (3) requiring each department to establish a procedure for joint student-faculty planning of the curriculum and major programs; (4) forming a committee of undergraduate majors to join each department in recommending the dismissal, retention or promotion of faculty members.

Colgate University (NY)
Students and faculty members have been seated on many trustee committees.

College of the Holy Cross (Mass)
The faculty voted to give students 12% of the votes in faculty meetings and a committee voice in hiring, dismissing, promoting and recommending tenure of the faculty.

Columbus College (Ga)
Two students will serve on the Admissions Policy Committee.

University of Connecticut
The governor of Connecticut named a student to the Board of Trustees to fill the unexpired term of a Board member who resigned.

Drake University (Iowa)
Ten students are members of the 70-member University Senate which recommends policies for university operation. Students are also represented on 18 of the standing committees of the University Senate.

Eastern Kentucky University
Students will serve as voting members of all but 2 administrative and academic committees. The exceptions are the Student Disciplinary Board and the Board of Regents, which have non-voting student members. The latter non-voting position of the Board of Regents is the result of a new state law. (See University of Kentucky for details of selection procedure.)

Eastern Montana College
Student representation was increased on faculty and administrative committees.

George Washington University (Wash, DC)
The Board of Trustees approved a resolution to invite to future meetings as a guest, the President of the Student Government.

Haverford College (Pa)
Two students, selected by the student association, will serve on the Board of Managers. Decisions are made by consensus and not by vote in this body. The students will not have the right to prevent consensus on final decisions. Nine other students will attend faculty meetings.

Howard University (Wash, DC)
The Trustees agreed to include student and faculty representatives on their Board and appointed a committee to work with the Faculty Senate and the Student Association to draw up a detailed plan. A bill describing the committee's proposal was introduced on May 12, 1969. The Board would be reduced from 24 to 15 trustees, with 8 members appointed by the President of the United States, 2 elected by tenured faculty, 3 elected by alumni and 2 elected by students. Students would have to be in their final year of undergraduate or graduate study in order to qualify. The colleges and professional schools have been directed by the University's president to draft plans for student voting representation in faculty organizations and committees. Within the School of Engineering and Architecture, student representatives from 5 departments attend faculty meetings, except for those on personnel matters. Each department now has a Student Activities Committee to study student grievances. At the School of Law, a student-faculty committee will discuss student participation at future faculty meetings. Most of the school's committees now have equal student representation, except for those concerned with faculty appointments, promotions and reappointments. The School of Social Work has included student members on most of its committees.

Humboldt State College (Cal)
Students were given voting representation on all major administrative bodies including the President's Council, the faculty Academic Senate, and the College Foundation. Students had previously gained representation on most major faculty committees.

University of Idaho
The College of Medicine faculty has added student members chosen by election to the faculty standing committees on instruction, student appraisal and student promotions.

Indiana State University
The student government president and vice president, as well as the editor of the student newspaper, will attend meetings of the Board of Trustees.

University of Iowa
Students work on more than half of the 21 policy-making committees of the University.

Kansas State Teachers College
Voting students will be added to the Faculty Senate committees; previously, student representatives attended Faculty meetings without voting privileges. Some joint committees between the Student and Faculty Senates are in operation, while others are being planned. Students serve on the college's long-range planning committee and its community relations committee.

University of Kentucky
A state law passed in April, 1968 provides for student membership on the Boards of Trustees of 6 state-supported institutions, including the University of Kentucky. The student government president for each of these institutions will serve

as a nonvoting member of the Board, attend all meetings and be eligible for committee appointments. The student member must be a Kentucky resident. The law provides for the selection of another student if the president of the student body should be an out-of-state student. The law was implemented at the University of Kentucky in May, 1969.

Lehigh University (Pa)
An ad hoc committee was formed by the Board of Trustees to investigate the feasibility of seating 2 student representatives on the Board.

Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
Students were added to all committees within the Division of Student Affairs.

Louisiana State University
Students were appointed to college course and curriculum committees.

University of Maine
The governor of Maine has named a student to a 3-year term on the Board of Trustees.

Marlboro College (Ver)
Students were added to all policy-making committees of the faculty. In Spring 1969, the Board of Trustees permitted nonvoting delegates from the faculty and student body to participate in their discussions.

Mary Washington College (Va)
Students will have representation on 4 standing committees of the faculty not previously open to students. These committees deal with academic counseling and guidance, instruction and academic affairs, curriculum, and library matters.

State College of Westfield (Mass)
Student representatives were added to 3 standing committees dealing with executive matters, curriculum, and disciplinary affairs.

Michigan State University
The faculty of the Department of Sociology voted to include undergraduate and graduate students as voting members on the committee which determines such matters as faculty hiring, firing, promotion and tenure. An amendment provides that there will also be student representatives on all departmental standing committees.

Millersville State College (Pa)
Students now participate in meetings of the Faculty Senate and will be elected as official Senate advisors during Fall 1969.

University of Minnesota
A Task Force on Student Representation has recommended that students become members of the University Senate and its committees (See Boren, Category II; *Report*, Category VI).

University of Missouri (Columbia)
Student representation has been increased on all campus-wide committees. Students have also been added to University committees dealing with student conduct, as well as several faculty committees.

University of Missouri (Kansas City)
Five students have been given full voting rights and committee privileges in the Faculty Senate. This change affects the campuses of the Missouri state system at Columbia, Rolla, St. Louis and Kansas City.

University of Nebraska
Three students will be included on a 9-member curriculum committee of the College of Arts and Sciences.

New Mexico State University
Since 1968, 2 students have served on each of the Faculty Senate's 16 committees.

New York University
One student representative from each undergraduate and graduate division of the University was included in the University Senate. Composition of the Senate is now 14 deans, 10 appointees of the University president, 24 elected faculty members and 16 students. Students will also be included on each committee of the Senate.

State University of New York (Genesco)
Students will have a voice in hiring faculty and deciding on curricular matters.

Northern Montana College
Student representation is being increased on faculty and administrative committees.

Oberlin College (Ohio)
Many "important" changes resulted from the participation of 2 students on the faculty educational policy committee.

Ohio University
Students serve as members of 38 University committees including the executive and priorities planning committees of the University.

University of Pittsburgh (Pa)
Students gained voting seats on student affairs, athletics, academic freedom and tenure, and budget policy committees.

Princeton University (NJ)
Juniors and seniors have elected a senior student to the Board of Trustees for a 4-year term.

Purdue University (Ind)
Five students were accepted as members with full voting rights to the Student Affairs Committee of the University Senate. The new members, of whom at least 1 must be a woman, will include 4 undergraduates and 1 graduate student.

Radford College (Va)
Students were added to 9 faculty committees.

Randolph-Macon College (Va)
The faculty voted to allow students to become full members of 5 faculty committees, including the curriculum committee.

University of Redlands (Cal)
The Faculty Senate voted to add students as voting members to committees on curriculum, personnel, foreign programs, and honors.

St. Mary's College (Md)
Two nonvoting students have been placed on every college committee, as well as on the Board of Trustees.

San Jose State College (Cal)
Students have been seated on several important faculty committees and given voting membership on the Academic Council, the College's legislative body (See Caffrey, Category VI).

Shippensburg State College (Pa)
Students were added to the curriculum committee.

Silvermine College of Art (Conn)
Students helped to choose new members of the Board of Trustees, 2 of whom were students.

University of South Alabama
Undergraduate and graduate students will serve on committees advising the Dean of the College of Education.

Southern State College (Ark)
The Student Senate president was given a permanent, non-voting seat on the Board of Trustees. Student Senate officers may address the Board and place items on its agenda.

Stanford University (Cal)
The Stanford Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) recommended changes that would increase student participation in University policy making (See *The Study of*, Category VI). Stanford trustees will invite students and faculty members to serve as voting members on most Board of Trustee committees, although they will not be given actual membership on the Board.

Syracuse University (NY)
Student representation on the University Senate was expanded from 1 to 45 members (See Splete, Category VI.)

University of Toledo (Ohio)
Students will be present at meetings of the Board of Trustees, but may not vote.

Towson State College (Md)
The president and vice president of the student body will become voting members of the College Senate.

Upper Iowa College
Two students have been added, with full voting privileges, to the College's executive committee, which formulates policy, exercises administrative control and determines budgetary matters.

Valdosta State College (Ga.)
Students have been admitted to membership on the Academic Council.

Vanderbilt University (Tenn)
Four students have become members of the Board of Trustees.

College of the Virgin Islands
Students are now voting members of the Administrative Council and almost all standing committees.

University of Wisconsin
The president of the Student Association has been given a voting seat on the City-University Coordination Committee. Students also advise on faculty qualifications and courses. *The Crow Report* (See Schwartz, ed., Category V; Ad Hoc Committee, Category VI) calls for increased student voting membership on all University committees.

Yale University (Conn)
The faculty voted to add 6 students each to 2 top faculty standing committees--the Executive Committee and the Course of Study Committee. The students will have full voting privileges. The Executive Committee is concerned with rules governing student life, and the Course of Study Committee deals with curricular matters. *The Report of the President* (See Brewster, Category VI) calls for increased student participation in Yale's governance.

II. FORMATION OF NEW COMMITTEES

Antioch College (Ohio)
A commission on governance recommended that: (a) 5 students and 5 faculty members serve for 2-year terms on a new Antioch College Council that would retain the powers of the Administrative Council; (b) an Education Council be formed composed of 16 students and 16 faculty members elected at large for 2-year terms; (c) the Dean of Faculty be responsible for developing and legislating educational policies and programs.

Austin Peay University (Tenn)
A student tribunal, composed of elected and appointed students, will serve as the principal judiciary body in student discipline cases with authority to hear and rule on any case involving an infraction of the University's regulations.

Brown University and Pembroke College (RI)
Students were included on committees to study such things as dormitory and food service arrangements and the bookstore. The Advisory Committee on Study Conduct, composed of 2 undergraduate and 1 graduate student, 3 administrative and 3 faculty members, made 28 recommendations which were endorsed by the administration, faculty, students and trustees. They proposed new substantive rules and structural arrangements for making and enforcing future student conduct rules. A University Council on Student Affairs, composed of 3 administrators, 3 faculty and 6 students, was created to propose rules and handle student conduct questions. The first year of implementation was 1967-68 (See Caffrey, Category VI).

Bucknell University (Pa)
A joint student-faculty-administration committee was formed to discuss and make recommendations about changes in student participation.

Columbia University (NY)
The trustees gave students and faculty members a voice in choosing a new president. Columbia students and faculty members elected separate committees for the search, but conducted joint meetings. The School of General Studies has established a student-faculty commission to redefine the school's structure, curriculum and enrollment policies.

Cornell University (NY)
The University Commission on the Interdependence of University Regulations and Local, State and Federal Law, composed of 4 students, 3 faculty members and 6 administrators, presented principles for a student conduct code and enforcement of a revised adjudicative system, as well as policy proposals on other problem areas (See Caffrey, Category VI). A 5-member review board made up of students, faculty and administrators was created as the court of last resort (See Morison, Category VI).

Davidson College (NC)
Students served on search committees to find a new president.

Drake University (Iowa)
Students are represented on 2 ad hoc committees of the University Senate–1 to select a new dean of the Journalism Department and a new Vice President of Student Life, and the other to plan a new health center.

Eastern Connecticut State College
A major revision in undergraduate course requirements in liberal arts and teacher education programs was suggested by the Curriculum Revision Committee of which students were members. The proposal was adopted.

Evergreen State College (Wash)
Students from other universities and colleges were hired to serve with experienced administrators on a planning committee to advise on all aspects of the new college due to open in 1971.

Georgetown University (Wash, DC)
Students are serving on a search committee to find a new University president.

GeorgeWashington University (Wash, DC)
The University Senate approved a temporary student court to try students accused of breaking University regulations. It will remain in existence until June 1970, or when a permanent student judiciary is created. The court will consist of a faculty advisor and 5 students appointed by the president of the Student Assembly and approved by the Assembly and the President.

Georgia Institute of Technology
Students had a voice in selecting a new president.

Hartwick College (Mass)
Students are serving on a search committee to find a new president.

Harvard University (Mass)
Harvard and Radcliffe formed a Policy Committee composed of students, faculty and administrators to deal with educational issues. The faculty passed a resolution establishing an executive committee to establish a new department for Black Studies, consisting of 4 faculty members, 2 students elected by the Association and 2 elected representatives of students majoring in the field. It has the power to draw up a curriculum for the department and choose faculty members. The Harvard Board of Overseers has established a committee composed of 11 students, 18 faculty members, 3 administrators, 1 alumnus, and 1 Harvard fellow to plan for changes in Harvard's structure. This 34-member committee will "identify the most important issues and recommend optimum structures and methods for considering them." It has been divided into 3 subcommittees to consider: faculty benefits, community relations, research policy, discipline, and cooperation with other institutions. A special committee of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences recommended that students be given formal, though indirect power in the formulation of faculty policy. Four student-faculty committees will propose legislation to the full faculty covering undergraduate life, university-community relations, undergraduate and graduate education. The faculty of Arts and Science approved a new panel to handle student discipline. The Committee on Rights and Responsibilities will be composed of 6 professors and 3 undergraduates.

University of Houston (Tex)
The student body president will serve on an advisory committee to select a new vice president and dean of faculties.

Howard University (Wash, DC)
Within the College of Pharmacy a student-faculty judiciary has been established consisting of 4 students, 4 faculty and headed by a student chairman. A faculty-student committee has been established at the College of Medicine to handle student-faculty relationships.

University of Iowa
The Vice President for Student Affairs has appointed a committee of students to advise him on matters of governance. The State Board of Regents invited a committee of 4 students to assist faculty and alumni in choosing a new president.

Kansas State University
Students in the department of political science have a student committee composed of 6 voting delegates, a moderator and 3 publicity officers to participate in faculty meetings, help evaluate prospective faculty members and conduct an evaluation of the faculty and curriculum. The Faculty Senate opened its meetings to all who wish to attend.

Maryville College of Sacred Heart (Mo)
The students have organized their own curriculum committee.

University of Michigan
A student advisory board was established to meet once every 2 weeks with the president and vice president.

Michigan State University
An ad hoc committee on Student Participation in Academic Affairs composed of 8 faculty and 5 students has been established. Students of Justin Morrill and James Madison Colleges will take an active part in planning their own curriculum and regulations.

New York University
The School of Education has appointed a student committee to review its program offerings.

State University of New York (Albany)
The Chancellor's Student Advisory Cabinet was formed. It is an advisory group composed of 22 Student Association presidents of the state-operated campuses of New York and the student presidents of 4 representative community colleges. The Cabinet meets 2 or 3 times each year with the Chancellor and representatives from the central administrative staff to discuss issues, policies and other matters of Univeristy-wide concern. "The Cabinet is not a governance body in the formal sense that it takes action on items under consideration but rather provides the opportunity for open discussion and improved community within a large and complex university."

State University of New York (Genesco)
Students and faculty members will have equal representation on the College Community Council.

State University of New York (New Paltz)
Student evaluation of classroom teaching will be considered in decisions on non-tenured faculty retention. Students will form a committee paralleling the college's Faculty Committee

on Tenure and Promotion and report directly to the President on the classroom performance of teachers.

Northern Illinois University
Students helped establish a new judicial system and will participate in its administration.

Northwestern University (Iil)
A student-alumni-faculty committee has been appointed to advise the Board of Trustees on the appointment of a new president.

Ohio University
Six special task forces composed of faculty, students, and administrators, will review and assess the program and operations of the University, including academic goals and priorities, student life, budget goals and procedures, resources, services, and facilities. A President's Advisory Council including faculty, student and administrative representatives has been created.

University of Pennsylvania
In addition to forming their own curriculum committee, students have joined with faculty and administrative representatives to discuss and make recommendations concerning changes in student participation in governance.

Plymouth State College (NH)
A joint student-faculty-administration Advisory Group on Disruption was organized to analyze campus tensions, with a view toward their prevention through student participation in college governance.

Pomona College (Cal)
An organization of professors and students called F.A.S.T. (Faculty and Students Together) won acceptance from the faculty and trustees for the establishment of a Black Studies Center.

Radford College (Va)
A 60-member student advisory board was created which will be kept informed of the College's policies and will offer opinions. The student legislature will decide upon the composition of the committee.

San Jose State College (Cal)
Several committees intended to increase student liaison with the faculty and administration have been created.

Southern Connecticut State College
Along with 3 other state colleges, Southern Connecticut has formed a Student Advisory Council to the Board of Trustees of State College which will meet with the Board at least once a month.

Southern Illinois University
Student advisory groups will meet with each school or college to discuss academic programs, curriculum, student relations and faculty matters.

Temple University (Pa)
A student subcomitttee of the University's Educational Programs and Policy Committee was created.

University of Texas
The faculty proposed student representation on committees for the selection of the president, vice presidents, deans and departmental chairmen.

Tufts University (Mass)
A student-faculty-administrative advisory board was created.

University of Utah
Student advisory committees serve in each of the University's approximately 70 departments. Their assignment is to make recommendations on tenure and retention, and particularly to consider student opinion on an individual's teaching ability. These committees have also participated in curriculum reviews, initial appointments and promotions. A Council of 20, composed of student leaders, administrators and faculty members, was formed to consider critical campus issues.

College of the Virgin Islands
A special Conference Group has been organized to advise the Board of Trustees. Four students will be elected annually to this group, serving with faculty and staff.

Western Texas State University
A committee of faculty, administrators and students was formed to determine student views on current issues.

University of Wisconsin
A joint student-faculty committee was formed to examine the "teaching situation."

III. NEW GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

University of California (Berkeley)
A task force composed of 3 student body presidents, 3 chancellors, and 3 faculty released its report on student participation in campus governance on December 29, 1969.

Columbia University (NY)
Special Committee of the Trustees evaluated Executive Committee's proposal for a University Senate. It submitted appropriate resoltuions amending the bylaws and statutes to implement recommendations. The Senate would have 21 of 101 student members and would be a policy-making body which considered all matters of University-wide concern, thus avoiding questions of tenure. Members of the Senate would be elected by at least 40% of their constitutencies. The new Senate was adopted and convened May 1969.

University of Connecticut
The president recommended formation of a unicameral government (See Babbidge, Category VI).

Dickinson College (Pa)
A Committee on Campus Governance, comprised of 8 faculty members and 8 students, is developing a resolution for a new governmental structure at Dickinson. Bicameral and unicameral legislative forms are being considered.

Duke University (NC)
Following a recommendation by the Student-Faculty-Administration Council, a committee including trustees, faculty and students was established to examine University governance.

Florida Atlantic University
Faculty and student senates agreed to dissolve their separate governing bodies and establish a unicameral government (See *A Progress Report*, Category VI).

Franklin and Marshall College (Pa)
In 1968 a new "College Senate" was established which replaced the faculty senate and which includes 3 students (See *The College*, Category VI).

George Washington University (Wash, DC)
On October 16, 1969, the Board of Trustees agreed to establish a "broadly representative commission" to determine if changes should be made in the University's government. The Trustees acted on a proposal of the president which recommended that the Commission include faculty, students, alumni, trustees, and friends of the University. President Elliott said the commission would be charged with examining "responsibility, authority and decision-making in the university."

University of Georgia
Students will be in charge of all general disciplinary action.

University of Kansas
A new University Senate including students was formed. (See Senate Category VI). There is substantial student membership on all Senate committees.

Kendall College (Ill)
In 1969 Kendall formed a College Council composed of 7 faculty members, 7 administrators and 7 students. Its authority is second only to the Board of Trustees and its responsibilities are to "shape the educational, communal and operational policies of Kendall." Students were largely responsible for the adoption of the Council.

Mansfield State College (Pa)
A new College Judiciary, consisting of 3 courts, has been established.

Maryville College (Tenn)
An All-College Council was established (See Blair, Category III).

Miami University (Ohio)
The Commission on Student Participation in University Life has proposed the creation of a new government structure (See Knock, Category VI).

University of Minnesota
Students became members of the University Senate and its committees (See *Report*, Category VI).

Morehead State University (Ky)
A University Senate including 12 students, 12 administrators and 25 faculty members was formed (See *Proposed Constitution*, Category VI).

Mount Holyoke College (Mass)
In *The Case for Participation* (HE 001 348) students make proposals for completely restructuring the College.

University of New Hampshire
A unicameral system of governance was established (See "Governing a College," Category VI; Jenks, Category VI).

State University of New York at Binghampton
A policy-making University assembly with a ratio of 5 faculty to 3 students to 2 administrators was established (See *Revised Report*, Category VI).

State University of New York (Old Westbury)
Students participated in planning and running the new college (See Wofford, Category VI).

Princeton University (NJ)
The Special Committee on the Structure of the University proposed the creation of a Council of the Princeton University Community, composed of undergraduates, graduate students and other units of the academic community (See *A Proposal*, Category VI).

Queens College (NY)
A Governance Report was compiled by the Ad Hoc Faculty-Student Committee on College Government (See *Governance Report*, Category VI).

Southern Methodist University (Tex)
A "Tentative Governance Plan" was published. "This governance proposal seeks to insure the significant involvement of students in decision-making in both the formal and informal life of learning" It recommends establishment of a University Academic Council, composed of 12 faculty members, 4 students, and 5 administrators, to formulate academic policy; and a University Assembly, composed of 16 faculty, 18 students and 6 administrators, to deal with extracurricular affairs.

Spring Hill College (Ala)
A College Senate incorporating students was established with broad authority over academic policies and student personnel services (See *Charter*, Category VI).

Stanford University (Cal)
A new system for campus rule-making and enforcing, giving students greater responsibility, was instituted. It includes a 11-man (6 faculty members and 5 students) student conduct legislative council to enact rules, and a 9 man (5 faculty members and 4 students) judicial council to have jurisdiction over all student disciplinary cases (See "Campus Government," Category VI; *The Study*, Category VI).

Trinity College (Conn)
The president established the Trinity College Council, an advisory body composed of 4 students, 4 faculty members and 4 administrators (See Smith, Category VI). A new adjudicative structure was proposed.

Yeshiva University (NY)
A new University Senate was established. Its membership is comprised of 6 students, 5 administrators, and 7 faculty members (See "Constitution," Category VI).